REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 281 JC 660 444

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE, REPORT OF A CONFERENCE SPONSORED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES AND THE COMMISSION FOR ACCREDITING CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES (LOS ANGELES, JULY 13-14, 1961).
CALIFORNIA UNIV., LOS ANGELES
REPORT NUMBER UCLA-JCLP-OR-3 PUB DATE JUN 62
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.60 63P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, *INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, *ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION, RESEARCHERS, ACCREDITATION (INSTITUTIONS), COLLEGE ROLE,

THE TEXTS OF PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE CONFERENCE AND A SUMMARY OF A PANEL DISCUSSION COMPOSE THE BODY OF THIS REPORT. THREE GENERAL QUESTIONS WERE IDENTIFIED AS SUITABLE TARGETS FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH--(1) WHAT CHANGES WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY IMPROVE THE EDUCATIONAL COMPETENCY OF STUDENTS. (2) WHAT CHANGES WOULD INCREASE AN INSTITUTION'S EDUCATIONAL EFFICIENCY. (3) WHAT CHANGES WOULD MOST REALISTICALLY RELATE AN INSTITUTION'S TOTAL EFFORT TO THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY IT SERVES. SUGGESTED ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS PROVIDE FOR (1) A FULL-TIME DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, (2) USE OF A RESEARCH PERSON FROM A UNIVERSITY TO SERVE AS A PART-TIME DIRECTOR, (3) COOPERATIVE EMPLOYMENT OF A FULL-TIME DIRECTOR BY SEVERAL COLLEGES IN A CENTRAL INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE. HAVING AS ITS PRIMARY PURPOSE THE PROVISION OF BASES FOR DECISIONS AND JUDGMENTS, INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH SHOULD BE SUPPORTED ONLY IF THE RESULTS ARE TO BE USED, THE FACULTY IS PREPARED FOR THE PROGRAM, AND THERE IS PROVISION FOR EVALUATION. REPORTS DESCRIBE SPECIFIC INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS AND THE RESULTS OF A STUDY OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN JUNIOR COLLEGES IN WESTERN STATES. (WO)

ERIC

ED014281

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 21 1966

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

OCCASIONAL REPORT FROM UCLA JUNIOR COLLEGE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM / NUMBER 3

JC 660 444

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

A Report of a Conference Sponsored
by the University of California at Los Angeles and
The Commission for Accrediting California Junior Colleges

July 13-14, 1961

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Occasional Report Number 3 June, 1962

JUNIOR COLLEGE LEADERSHIP PROGRAM
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: B. Lamar Johnson....5

THE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH....7
Thomas B. Merson

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH, Lewis B. Mayhew....12

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN JUNIOR COLLEGES OF WESTERN STATES, B. Lamar Johnson....20

SYMPOSIUM: INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

1 AT ORANGE COAST COLLEGE, James H. Nelson....30
2 AT EL CAMINO COLLEGE, Stuart E. Marsee....34
3 IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGES OF LOS ANGELES, Walter T. Coultas....36
4 AT AMERICAN RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE, Audrey G. Menefee....38
5 IN WASHINGTON JUNIOR COLLEGES, George Hodson....41
6 AT CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO, Thomas F. Nesbitt....43
7 AT FOOTHILL COLLEGE, Calvin C. Flint....46

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ACCREDITATION, Lewis B. Mayhew....51

PANEL: INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND THE ACCREDITATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, Henry T. Tyler, Chairman....58

INTRODUCTION

The Conference on Institutional Research in the Junior College—held on July 13 and 14, 1961—was the sixth summer meeting jointly sponsored by the University of California at Los Angeles and the Commission for Accrediting California Junior Colleges. The previous five were concerned with varied problems and developments related to accreditation:

1955—The Accreditation of California Junior Colleges.

1956—Utilization of Instruments for the Evaluation of Instruction in California Junior Colleges.

1957—Junior College Accreditation in California: A Preliminary Appraisal.

1958—Flexibility and Consistency in the Accreditation of California Junior Colleges.

1960—Preparation for Accreditation.

Surveys of institutional research in California junior colleges have revealed that applications for accreditation have made extensive use of the findings of such investigations and that a high percentage of studies made by two-year colleges have been motivated by preparation for accreditation.

The Commission for Accrediting California Junior Colleges is currently considering possible changes in the process of applying for accreditation—and particularly in that for reaccreditation. Some have proposed procedures for "streamlining applications," and some have suggested greater emphasis on institutional research and types of organization for carrying it out. On the contrary, others insist that there are dangers if, as a part of the accreditation process, formalized or structured attention is given to such studies. These and other issues were considered at the conference by a panel titled "Institutional Research and Accreditation."

The conference by no means limited its attention to these relationships. The role and organization of institutional research in and of itself was given major attention, and practices in junior colleges were reported and discussed.

Attendance of more than 150—with junior colleges from nine states represented—indicated active interest in the theme of the conference. There have been many conferences on institutional research, but none—previous to the one here reported—on junior college activity in this field. The relatively few representatives of two-year colleges who have attended meetings on institutional studies have upon occasion commented on the need for well-wrought investigations of problems and developments on their campuses. In correspondence regarding plans for this conference the Director of Research in a major university wrote, "Congratulations on accomplishing a first! I have been involved in a number of institutional research institutes, and each time I have felt that their programs did not really meet the needs of junior college administrators."

The Conference Planning Committee included the following members of the Commission for Accrediting California Junior Colleges:

Albert D. Graves, Vice-president, Los Angeles State College

Wade F. Thomas, Jr., President, Santa Monica City College, and Chairman of the Commission

Henry T. Tyler, Executive Secretary, California Junior College Association

B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education, University of California at Los Angeles, Chairman.

President Thomas was conference chairman and presided at all of its sessions.

Dorothy J. Wilson of the Office of Relations with Schools, University of California, Los Angeles, prepared the report of the panel on Institutional Research and the Accreditation of Junior Colleges.

Because of the obvious relevance of institutional research to junior college administration—and to the preparation of junior college administrators—it is appropriate that this report is published as Occasional Report Number 3 of the UCLA Junior College Leaderhip Program.

B. Lamar Johnson

University of California, Los Angeles June 1, 1962

THE IMPORTANCE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

THOMAS B. MERSON, *Assistant Director for Commissions*
American Association of Junior Colleges

Let's begin in good research style by restating the topic as a question: "Is institutional research important in the junior college?" Or we might be even more precise: "In what ways and to what degree is institutional research important in the junior college?" Thus stated the title of this address becomes a research topic, and both you and I know that the research needed to answer this query has not been made.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION.

This question well illustrates the decisions which confront us as we, in our junior colleges, face most of our basic problems. We encounter problems; we have a certain amount of experience on which to base our choices of action; then we act on the basis of our experience with very limited additional information to guide us. Furthermore, such information as we use is largely empirical and is frequently untested. Continued application of our choice of action reinforces our confidence in our original judgment without increasing its validity. Soon the procedure we have elected to use becomes accepted common practice; it becomes a tradition and any suggestion for change meets the resistance of comfortable complacency. By choice we try to leave as it is anything which is running smoothly. We hope problems will not arise. We try to avoid them, or rationalize that they do not exist or that they are not important. Such action characterizes both administration and teaching. Pressed by the many problems which seek us out — as administrators, teachers, counselors — we are not readily inclined to seek problems for study and investigation.

Periodically one of our staff may decide to do a doctoral study. He starts with a resolution to set the educational world right once and for all. His drive carries him through required predoctoral courses and eventually he starts to plan his study. Soon he realizes that data are difficult to collect and that he must select a problem which gives some promises of yielding defensible conclusions. He also recognizes his limitations of time, energy, and finance. His wife may announce the pending arrival of an addition to the family. His dean may ask when he will start working at the college again. His university adviser needles him incessantly. Before he even starts his research he is ready to settle for the quickest and easiest problem which he can find. The pressure for getting the degree quickly dims his eyes to the stars which were so bright such a short time ago. The contribution of the research of doctoral candidates to institutional improvement is all too often minimal.

Another group, chiefly administrators, may initiate study of knotty events in hope of eliminating frustrations which result from facing recurring problems. These researchers frequently literally bury themselves in data and spend evenings, weekends and holidays tabulating, classifying, and compiling their findings. Sometimes they organize these data into a few tables. But too often, long before their studies are completed, other tasks demand their energy and attention and they must leave their investigations partly completed to become obsolescent. Their studies rarely progress to the point where conclusions are sufficiently convincing to result in change. More often change, if made, is based on judgment derived from information obtained from sources other than the findings of this research and the entire effort has contributed little. Frequently it adds to increased skepticism regarding the value of research and research effort.

This is currently about the state of affairs in junior college institutional research: a scattering of doctoral studies largely unrelated to each other and frequently dealing with our less crucial problems; and piles of unfinished institutional studies which only partly illuminate the problems they were intended to resolve. "Whether we look or whether we listen, it's not hard to see that 'somethin's missin'."

B. LESSONS FROM BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY.

The following points seem to be sound assumptions:

1. Education is big business. Higher education currently spends 3½ billion dollars annually, employs 200,000 highly skilled personnel, and enrolls 3½ million students.[1]
2. Business and industry depend heavily upon research. New products created by research quickly replace old-line products. A static business rarely survives in today's competition.
3. Education is allotting less effort and money to research than big business finds necessary and profitable.
4. Research is the major means of achieving sound solutions to problems either educational or noneducational.
5. Much educational research is neither well conceived nor organized primarily to bear directly on basic and crucial educational problems. Largely because of this, many who support the principle that research generally is valuable make the case that, unlike research in some other fields, educational research is not essential, nor productive and even perhaps undesirable. If this claim is true we dare not let it persist.
6. Productive research is time consuming and expensive. But efficient and effective education is so imperative for our welfare we cannot afford to neglect research required to improve it. The profits of research in business and industry give ample evidence that *well designed research programs pay greater dividends than any other kind of investment.*
7. Education *must* find ways to use research productively.

These assumptions are supported by Coombs, whom I shall quote at some length, and who points out that:

> .... educators may find some useful lessons in other sectors of our economy.
>
> .... Some industries do not seem to have had a really important new idea or major invention for years; their costs keep rising and their products get no better or even deteriorate. Others, however, are constantly inventing new products, improving old ones, raising the efficiency of their methods, and reducing costs. These are the industries that pave the way to higher living standards for the nation.

---

[1] A. J. Brumbaugh. *Research Designed to Improve Institutions of Higher Learning.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960. p. 2.

> . . . . Their research and development expenditures are high, and they are geared organizationally and psychologically for rapid change.
>
> The chemical industry has averaged an 11 per cent annual growth rate since the war, compared to only 5 per cent for industry generally. Chemical companies spend 3 per cent or more of their sales dollar on research and development . . . .
>
> Over the past decade the electronics industry has grown at a rate three times faster than the national economy . . . . This unprecedented rate of growth has been attributed largely to the industry's expenditure on research and development . . . .
>
> Petroleum research over the past 40 years has raised the yield of gasoline from a barrel of crude oil from 12 per cent to nearly 50 per cent . . . .
>
> Thanks to large agricultural research expenditures . . . . productivity has risen more rapidly on the farms than in most industries . . . . Far more agricultural production is being turned out today than a generation ago,with much *less human effort*. Government estimates indicate that total man hours worked in agriculture fell from 24 billion hours in 1920 to 11 billion in 1950.[2]

Coombs further notes:

> Education is one of the nations largest "growth industries," measured by its employment; its annual expenditures, its rate of expansion, its capital facilities and the rapidly expanding clientele it serves. One-fourth of all living Americans are attending school or college today.
>
> Despite its size and rapid growth, however, and despite the enormous contribution it has made to progress elsewhere in society, education has been notoriously slow to change its own internal arrangements . . . .
>
> . . . . Change in education is a slow process of refinement and accumulation, involving addition and multiplication, seldom subtraction or division. One has only to study the history of the curriculum to see that new substance and new labels are constantly added but seldom is anything dropped. There is an overpowering stability in the curriculum. As one frustrated college administrator observed, it is easier to move a cemetery than to overhaul a curriculum.[3]

In urging the need for research in education Coombs asserts, . . . we must invest much more in research and development and sustain a vigorous technological frontier for education . . .

> . . . . Instead of devoting less than 1/10 of one per cent of the educational dollar to research and development, we should be devoting at least two per cent.[4]

C. NEEDS IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE.

The assumptions suggested above and the arguments advanced by Coombs apply to all of higher education and, indeed, to all of education. They were as true yesterday as today. But the events of tomorrow promise to make them even more valid and imperative for the junior college. The

---

[2] Philip H. Coombs. "The Technical Frontiers of Education." The Twenty-seventh Annual Sir John Adams Lecture at the University of California, Los Angeles, delivered March 15, 1960. [School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles]. pp. 4-6.

[3] Ibid., p. 6-7.

[4] Ibid., p. 10-11, 13.

needs for education, especially higher education, are changing dramatically. The junior college is growing more rapidly than any other segment of higher education because it is responsive to changing needs. To be successful the junior college must be fluid; it cannot remain static and fulfill its mission. Because it must grow rapidly, because it must change continually and remain flexible, the junior college more than any other segment of higher education must continually conduct research to guide its decisions.

But what kind of institutional research will yield greatest dividends to the junior college? This question faces anyone engaged in research design. Rarely can one predict with accuracy the eventual impact of a given research effort. We must recognize at the outset that some, perhaps much, research will not lead directly and immediately to improvements of major significance. Mindful of our limitations of time, energy and resources, we must select our research projects carefully. Three questions may well serve as criteria for selecting research projects which have promise of yielding sought improvements:

1. What changes would substantially improve the educational competence of our students?
2. What changes would increase our educational efficiency?
3. What changes will most realistically relate our total institutional effort to the impending needs of the next decade?

Substantial effort directed toward definitive answers to these general questions will surely lead to dividends of long duration.

More limited and specific problems are, however, worthy of brief comment. Foremost among these might well be a critical evaluation of the extent to which we are achieving our stated functions. To what degree do our transfer courses prepare students for advanced study? What are the factors which distinguish the successful from the unsuccessful transfers in different majors?

Which experiences in our vocational-technical curricula are most directly related to vocational success? What important experiences are neglected or underemphasized and which experiences are time-wasters?

What evidence do we have that the lives of our students are richer and more productive as a result of general education?

To what extent are our students enrolled in programs compatible with their interests, abilities and preparation? To what extent is talent wasted by poor programming?

In what ways can the college and community increase their cooperation for the betterment of both?

By what means may faculty be stimulated to their optimum potential?

What motivates students toward desired ends?

By what means can we increase the efficiency of use of staff and facilities?

Can unit cost analyses identify savings which can be alloted to (research) projects which in turn may lead to improved education?

How can a favorable image of the junior college be developed by the public at large, by universities, by business and industry and by high school counselors?

What is the extent of the impact of a nursing or a technology program on the welfare of our community?

This list of suggested problems could be extended indefinitely. Major improvements could be expected from a reasonable amount of study and attention to any of these questions.

D. CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, it is clear that a junior college, through a well conceived program of institutional research, can anticipate increased effectiveness, better morale, improved public esteem, and savings in costs. We know that the effects of a stimulating and inspiring teacher have impact on several generations. The effects of an excellent college may well continue forever.

The junior colleges of other states look to California for leadership. The nation is looking to the junior colleges for a new kind of education. Research is the tested tool for extending frontiers. Surely the importance of institutional research in the junior college is clear. It is our responsibility to make arrangements to benefit from its potential.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

LEWIS B. MAYHEW, *Director,*
Evaluation and Research, University of South Florida
and Director of Research, Stephens College

Institutional Research is a relatively new concept in collegiate education. It is likewise relatively new in industry, business and the military. Prior to World War II few corporations saw virtue in investing substantial effort in research and development. Operations were assumed to be adequate until catastrophe or sheer deterioration forced new processes. Even the military, which did much to initiate post war respectability for research, cared little for formal inquiries into a variety of problems on which research could speak. Its selection procedures had advanced but little beyond the testing done during the first World War. It was only during World War II that the Office of Special Services studied such matters as the effectiveness of calesthenics, how soldiers wanted to return home, and what factors made for high esprit de corps. Its officer rating scale was not changed until after World War II.

Colleges lagged even behind the military. Since higher education was not big business, the larger society did not really care how institutions used their relatively small resources. Faculties were engrossed in their own research and in living the good life which static academies granted; hence they were not really concerned with research intended to examine the practices in which they were engaged.

There were a few exceptions. In 1921 Stephens College appointed W.W. Charters as Director of Research. The germinal mind of Ralph Tyler helped establish research offices at Ohio State University and at the University of Chicago. The University of Minnesota and the University of Illinois created specialized kinds of offices to answer troublesome questions. The University of Illinois, for example, was one of the first (in 1932, I believe) to regularly check enrollments in each of its courses and to eliminate those which did not attract enrollment. Now, however, the number of colleges giving formal attention to institutional research appears to be doubling each year. Offices of institutional research take one of several forms or assume one or more of several categories of responsibilities.

A. ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH.

One type of service largely limits its work to gathering facts for the administrative arm of the institution. The president in his statements to the legislature or to his constituency must have relatively precise information about such matters as space utilization, student morality, cost of instruction and cost of building. Then too, the president must be aware of the substance of the increasing flow of factual information about higher education, most of which he obviously cannot read and digest himself. An institutional research service, lodged in the person of an administrative assistant, a registrar, or even a director of institutional research, provides a means for the president to obtain these data. One complicated institution even created a separate dean whose chief responsibility was to accumulate factual information on higher education.

A second variety of office of institutional research assumes somewhat broader duties and obviously requires a larger staff. In addition to routine fact gathering, an agency such as the Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University provides research service to the University and also to the larger community outside of the institution. The Offices of Institutional Research at the University of Minnesota and at the University of Mississippi provide similar services to the institution itself. A general mode of procedure is for an agency within the University (at some universities, also within the community) to request help in solving a problem. The research office surveys the problem, accumulates requisite information and prepares a report complete with recommendations. Such offices have, for example, studied college enrollment trends, plans for high school seniors, the frequency of use of television within a state system of education, the proportion of students failing college algebra who lacked a third year of high school mathematics, the cost of building various types of high schools, and the types of text books used in public high schools. Offices organized under such a plan ordinarily consider themselves to be at the service of their parent organizations and have no research programs of their own. A problem arising from such a structure is that requests for service frequently far exceed the resources of the research office. Expansion of staff or restriction of service serves to offer the most likely solution to this problem.

A third type, and one less frequently encountered, is concerned not only with service research, but also with studies of its own devising. Members of the staff have problems in which they have a personal concern and the resources of the staff are used to investigate these. Not infrequently, at least part of the support for such projects comes from outside sources. Outside support virtually never, however, covers the full cost of projects. The Office of Evaluation Services at Michigan State during the 1940's and 1950's approximated this type of agency. It produced a number of basic studies which had only indirect immediate practical value for the university. A variety of problems were studied including the relationship of value change to growth in critical thinking ability, a taxonomy of affective outcomes of education, clinical study of personality structure, and stimulated recall of intellectual processes used in answering test questions. The support of such a unit requires a relatively affluent institution and probably one of considerable size.

A last type of organization is one in which the accumulation of routine information, the service functions and the basic research efforts are related to a definite administrative function. In such an office the staff might identify a problem of concern to the entire institution, study it and then develop a program to bring about institutional change. This structure requires administrative responsibility given to the director and development of confidence in the office by the faculty. It has been my impression that the Office of Institutional Research of Pennsylvania State University possesses many of the characteristics of this type. Its research on closed circuit television resulted in programs in which the office had an administrative role. The findings of its studies of residence halls and office space were placed directly into operation by the director working with architects. Its speculations about intensified calendaring were made operational for the institution by the office itself.

B. EXAMPLES OF ORGANIZATION AND PROGRAMS IN SELECTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Full meaning to these categories may best be achieved by a consideration of some specific examples. Stephens College, a two year women's college, has had a part-time director of research since 1921. For twenty-five years the late W. W. Charters held positions at various universities and served part-time at Stephens. He was directly responsible to the president and had free access to the faculty. In judging his success it should be recognized that he had been a member of the Board of Curators of Stephens and had been instrumental in employing the president under whom he later worked as Director of Institutional Research. During his tenure the Research Service carried out several monumental studies. It studied diaries of women and on the basis of the activities they reported, evolved the curricular structure for Stephens which still exists. The service also codified terms descriptive of character and derived the Ten Ideals which serve as a value focus for the student body.

Stephens College still maintains the part-time conception of Director of Research. Recently its Research Service has guided the faculty in an institutional self-study and has developed proposals, now in operation, for amplified telephone teaching, team teaching, and automated learning. It has begun an extensive study of the Stephens admissions program and is examining the newly created Bachelor of Fine Arts degree. A good bit of the time of the director is spent in helping faculty members organize experiments of their own. The service also provides technical assistance and computational facilities when needed. The point of view of Stephens College is that any aspect of the institution is open to scrutiny by the research service, provided only that the president and the Faculty Research and Planning Board sanction the study.

The institutional research function at Syracuse University is somewhat decentralized. The actual director of institutional research is also the registrar and is responsible for preparing the routine statistical summaries needed by the institution. In addition, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs has an assistant who makes somewhat more complicated studies, and reports on them directly to the administration. The Division of Psychological Services makes basic studies. Under the leadership of C. Robert Pace, this Division has made major contributions in its College Characteristics and Student Activities Indexes and its work on the authoritarian personality.[5]

Michigan State University for years used an even more decentralized method of meeting institutional research needs. The Office of Evaluation Services and the Counseling Center were responsible for many studies of students and their achievement in the University. The Dean of All University Services and the Registrar were responsible for reporting on routine factual data. The Psychology Department maintained a clinic and a research program, and the Bureau of Educational Research of the College of Education offered research service to the public schools of the state. This system operated well during the initial period of intensive growth at Michigan State. However, as the university faced the complexities of the 1960's, it saw virtue in centralizing some of these duties. The Office of Institutional Research is now responsible to the Provost and is divided into several departments. One is concerned with space information and the actual assignment of space; a second is concerned with personnel data concerning both students and faculty, and a third branch deals with educational research which has special relevance for planning in collegiate education. From this last unit will come the studies of some of the major educational innovations the university will attempt during the next years. The Office of Institutional Research was created on the recommendation of a Faculty Committee on the Future of the University. This same committee laid down the major direction the institution should follow in the years ahead. The Office will clearly play a major role in implementing proposals for the future.

---

[5] Dr. Pace is currently (beginning in 1960-61) a Professor of Higher Education at the University of California, Los Angeles.

The Office of Institutional Research at the University of Minnesota has had a long history. Originally it was designed to work closely with the faculty on educational problems. Because of the interest of several of its early leaders it became more and more an adjunct of the President's Office. It accumulated a variety of information about students, faculty, the high school population and prepared these data into highly useful reports, both for Minnesota and for higher education as a whole. More recently the Office has been seeking ways to be of greater service to the faculty. It has prepared brochures on testing, has investigated the backgrounds of college teachers in Minnesota, and has begun to work with faculties of the various colleges of the University on some of their problems.

Vassar College, largely through grants from the Mellon Foundation, has evolved a unique pattern. Under the part-time leadership of Nevitt Sanford, Vassar recruited a team of distinguished research specialists who, over the past five years, have conducted major studies of students in Vassar. They have examined Vassar as a sub-culture and student and faculty communities as still smaller sub-cultures. They have traced the emotional evolution of students through four years at Vassar and have compared attitudes of present students with those of graduates. They have correlated emotional and intellectual growth of students and have been responsible for some of the most significant generalizations about contemporary college students. It is from their work that there came the analogy of the student sub-culture to an American colony in a foreign land. Students may visit the foreign shops (the offices and classrooms of the faculty) but must not acquire too many of the foreign traits else they would become outcasts from their own group. A few students do go native, i.e., acquire the full intellectualism of the faculty, but most fear to do so.

Florida State University has likewise developed a unique type of organization. Its Director of Institutional Research is also head of the Department of Higher Education. A number of his graduate students do research on problems of Florida State, as well as for the staff of the Board of Control, the governing body for the state universities in Florida. The Office of Institutional Research is annually responsible for several large studies required by the state, including one on space utilization and another on costs of instruction. The office makes numerous studies of practices at other institutions to help the administration plot the course of the university. Florida State's research staff is prolific in the preparation of reports and routinely sends copies to the presidents and directors of research at sister institutions.

Similar to offices of institutional research in many respects are the testing offices in some colleges and universities. Antioch College for years has had a small testing office which administered group testing, reported results, and coordinated the comprehensive examination used at Antioch. This office has helped in a number of broad educational experiments, including appraisal of the cooperative work program. More recently, Antioch has created a separate office for institutional research — based, however, on the tradition of the testing service. The University of Chicago through its University and College Examiner did much of what could be classified as institutional research. In addition, to preparing the comprehensive examinations which were its basic tasks, the Board of Examiners carried on a variety of research projects. The Progressive Education Association Eight Year Study and the original Cooperative Study of General Education were lodged there. The Board of Examiners did a number of studies on personality and at least one major study on the characteristics of Nobel prize winners. The University of Florida also has an elaborate testing office, the primary responsibility of which is the administration of orientation tests and comprehensive examinations. However, the office also developed a Florida 12th grade testing program and reports continuously about the predictive power of that battery. Presently, the University Examiner is the executive officer for an institutional self-study being conducted by the University. Chatham College has a testing office, the director of which each year singles out some one aspect of the institution for scrutiny through research.

The University of South Florida has created a somewhat different organization. It has joined the titles of Director of Institutional Research and Director of Evaluation Services and assigned them to one individual. This person is responsible for all group testing for the University, for test service and test consultation. His office prepares the final examinations for the College of Basic Studies and reports on them to the faculty. The Director is responsible for cost and space studies, for the prediction of enrollment and for periodic assessment of student attitudes. The office administers the Student Evaluation Program and related studies of teaching effectiveness. In addition, because university publications of an academic nature need precise information, the Director is responsible for those. The office produced the catalogue, the staff handbook and a book on the intellectual tone of the University this past year. The director sits as a member of most curricular committees with the aim of bringing relevant research findings to bear on problems discussed. Since effectiveness of space utilization is important, the Director is jointly responsible with the Registrar for class schedules. An important task of this office is in connection with a study of the role and scope of the university, in which an effort is being made to determine the future direction of the institution. The office is also responsible for keeping the president informed on relevant research findings from the volume of reports now emerging.

A last example is found in cooperative studies of various sorts, perhaps the most significant of which were the cooperative research studies of the North Central Association's Study on Liberal Arts Education. In the states of Ohio, Indiana, Kansas and Illinois, groups of colleges cooperated on institutional research projects of importance to all of them. In Illinois, a three-year study resulted in better ways of teaching for critical thinking. In Ohio, eight colleges studied ways of providing for gifted students and in Kansas, another eight colleges studied the improvement of instruction. Four Indiana colleges concentrated on the improvement of the intellectual tone of the university. Another example is the Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education sponsored by the American Council on Education. The three and one-half year effort of the nineteen cooperating colleges resulted in the development of new and effective instruments and some significant generalizations about the programs studied.

C. INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE.

With these examples as a background it is appropriate to turn to the unique problems of the community college. Obviously, publicly supported junior colleges cannot support any of the more elaborate offices described above. There are the fiscal limitations imposed by state or county law. One suspects that many school codes do not provide for a director of institutional research. If one were to be appointed, support would have to come from an already authorized administrative position or function. Agencies within a college would quite naturally look with skepticism on using a counseling or a physical education position as the basis for a college-wide research operation. Within the two-year college there may also be an emotional barrier to institutional research. Junior college instructors are frequently oriented to secondary rather than to collegiate education. Teaching loads of fifteen or eighteen hours allow little time for work on research projects. Further, faculty members may not be immediately sensitive to the need for them. Space in community college buildings for a research center is also hard to find as well as are qualified persons to direct and carry out technical studies.

These problems can, however, be overcome if an institution values research. In such an event a college may elect any of several different patterns. It may appoint a full-time director. This should be a person who has had teaching experience and who can command the respect of the faculty. He should have a good background in mathematics and should be able to work with electronic data processing. He should have at least a master's degree and a doctorate would be preferable. The director should be familiar with the problems of education but should not have a rigidly established position on issues. After all, he must take a somewhat detached view of problems to be investigated. A good way to kill an institutional research program is to have a director who throws technical language at the faculty. The office of institutional research should be responsible to either the president or the academic dean and should be given a budget large enough to support whatever program is decided upon.

A second alternative is for the community college to work out an arrangement with some research person located in a university to serve as part-time director. Ralph Tyler has had such an affiliation with the University of Rochester for years. Paul Dressel has similarly been associated with the University of Delaware, and Nevitt Sanford has worked with Vassar. These part-time directors can carry out some studies, frequently using their own graduate students to assist. They further can serve as educational consultants to the faculty and administration, and can stimulate faculty members to carry out institutional research projects of their own. Although a part-time director cannot do all of the things a full-time director can, he can accomplish much for a relatively small cost. The annual budget of the research service at Stephens College has rarely exceeded $16,000 a year and that included four to six thousand dollars for faculty summer workshops on research projects.

It might be possible for several community colleges cooperatively to employ a director of research. He could spend part time on each campus and, in addition to his research efforts, could serve a useful cross-fertilization purpose. Whether sufficient incentive could be provided to attract a person to do this as a career is conjectural. It might, however, be possible.

Similar in nature might be a cooperative venture in which each of as many as sixty to eighty colleges would contribute to the support of a central institutional research service. In return, the service would provide the effective leadership for whatever institutional research projects each college was currently undertaking. The central office, knowing that college A was interested in the improvement of instruction, could ask some near-by expert to spend several days at the institution. The central office could also communicate research findings from one college to another and could organize such special activities as summer workshops, special seminars and the publication of research reports. Such a cooperative arrangement could make important contributions to the life of each of the cooperating institutions.

Regardless of which structure may be adopted, there are a number of problems within community colleges toward the solution of which institutional research can contribute. A research service can be responsible for routine reports on the academic aptitude of students, grade distribution, cost of instruction, course enrollment, space utilization, enrollment trends and predictions, summaries of faculty professional activities, summaries of student course evaluation and studies of the relationship of grades to academic aptitude. A second major responsibility of a research service is the conduct of institutional self-studies. If present trends continue we can predict that all colleges will be required to conduct institutional self-studies at least once a decade. The duties of coordinating such efforts and then analyzing and using the results provide an office of institutional research with an almost continuous program of activities. To this should be added the general responsibility for studies leading to curricular reform. These entail considerable work with faculty groups and must go on constantly. The community college cannot hope to support much basic research. The possibility of making basic research studies should not, however, be excluded. The director may obtain his greatest professional satisfaction from undertaking such efforts. Whenever this happens the institution stands to gain.

The function of institutional research has considerable potential for community colleges, just as it has for four-year institutions. It represents an attempt to help people make judgments on the best available information rather than relying on intuition. Findings from institutional research have repeatedly been crucial in arriving at decisions. Michigan State embarked on an elaborate scholarship program after discovering the abilities of its normal student body. Alma College instituted a course in the humanities after discovering how little her students knew about the field. Pennsylvania State University began large-scale closed circuit television after discovering it was an effective medium of instruction. The University of South Florida recruited faculty after finding in what courses prospective students were interested.

Several cautions should, however, be made. Institutional research should be supported only if its results are to be used. There is danger of fadism here as in many other innovations. If institutional research deals with matters which are not of concern to the faculty or administration, or if its results are simply filed, the college cannot afford institutional research.

Since the concept of institutional research is both important and is difficult to communicate, considerable faculty preparatory work through faculty committees is necessary before the establishment of a full scale program. Since only insofar as institutional research is accepted by the faculty will its results be respected and used, administrators should guard against the temptation to start institutional research prematurely.

The office of institutional research must be subjected to the same kind of analysis it makes of other parts of the institution. It will be staffed by people who do err. At the time a program is initiated plans for its continuous appraisal should be made.

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGES OF WESTERN STATES

B. Lamar Johnson
Professor ofHigher Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Despite a recently burgeoning interest in institutional research and a consequently expanding literature in the field, little has been written about this kind of activity in the junior college. And yet, a junior college pioneered the use of continuing research as a basis for program development and improvement. It was in 1921 that the late W. W. Charters accepted appointment to the staff of Stephens College and began an association that was to continue until 1949—twenty-eight years later—when he retired as Director of Research at the College.

During the past three years the Office of Statistical Information and Research of the American Council on Education has periodically published its "Report on Current Institutional Research." In the eighteen issues which have been published to date (Number 1, May 12, 1958 to Number 18, January 24, 1961) materials have been included from thirty-four colleges and universities. Only one of these, Stephens College, is a junior college.

There is, however, an increasing recognition of the importance of well-wrought investigations in the junior college. In an address at the 1961 Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Stickler pointed out the sharply expanding interest in institutional research, urged its value for the junior college, and suggested guidelines for developing an effective program in the two-year college.[6]

Junior Colleges do conduct institutional studies. Fifty-five two-year colleges participated in Sprague's 1959 survey of institutional research in the West—and forty-four of these reported studies they had made.[7] In his recent study of investigations in Los Angeles junior colleges, Swanson identified 198 different studies—and he points out that his list is by no means complete.[8]

It is my purpose this forenoon to report the findings of a recent survey of institutional research in one hundred junior colleges in thirteen Western states.

In April of this year, I addressed an inquiry to the chief administrators of 124 junior colleges in thirteen Western states.[9] Questions were asked about how colleges are organized (including plans for the future) for conducting institutional research and regarding the nature of investigations that have been made. Suggestions for topics to be considered at this conference were also solicited.

---

[6] W. Hugh Stickler. "The Expanding Role of Institutional Research in American Junior Colleges." *Junior College Journal*, 31: 542-548. May, 1961.

[7] Hall T. Sprague. *Institutional Research in the West.* The Western Interstate Comission for Higher Education, 1959.

[8] Herbert L. Swanson. "Survey of Institutional Research in Los Angeles Junior Colleges." (unpublished manuscript). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1961.

[9] The inquiry form was in part adapted from one used by W. Hugh Stickler. *Institutional Research Concerning Land-Grant Institutions and State Universities.* (mimeographed). Tallahassee: Office of Institutional Research and Service, Florida State University, Tallahassee, 1959. pp. 41-43.

TABLE I
JUNIOR COLLEGES INCLUDED IN SURVEY

Type of College	Number Invited to Participate	Number Responding	Per Cent of Response
Public	111	95	85.6
Private	13	5	38.4
Total:	124	100	80.7

As will be noted in Table I, one hundred colleges (more than eighty per cent of those addressed) responded to the inquiry. Since the junior college in the West is predominantly tax supported, it is not surprising that 95 of those participating are public institutions. It will also be observed, however, that 85 per cent of the tax supported colleges responded as compared with replies from only 38 per cent of the independent institutions. The low percentage of response from these colleges is undoubtedly due largely to the fact that the thirteen private two-year colleges in the states included in the survey are small institutions. Their total enrollments range from 15 to 1998 — with a median of 123.[10]

The median enrollment of the one hundred colleges participating in the survey is 1,320 — with a range from 94 to 22,849. Sixty-two are California institutions; seven are located in Washington and five in Wyoming. The remaining 26 colleges are in Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon and Utah.

A. ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Since the major purpose of the survey was to secure information about the administration and operation of the research program, questions regarding organization were included on the inquiry form.

Types of organization. Data in Table II indicate that less than one-third (29 per cent) of the junior colleges are organized to carry on coordinated research. Most of these (27 per cent) have part-time coordination, usually an individual, but in four colleges a committee. Two institutions report full-time coordination. One of these has an administrative dean for institutional research and the other a faculty committee whose chief responsibility is institutional studies.

TABLE II
ORGANIZATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN 100 WESTERN JUNIOR COLLEGES

Type of Organization	Number	Per Cent
Full-time coordination	2	2
Part-time coordination	27	27
Decentralized organization	43	43
Little institutional research	28	28
Total	100	100

The median enrollment of colleges which provide coordination for institutional research is 2,130 and that for colleges with a decentralized type of organization is 2,373. In the present survey there is no evidence that the size of a college is related to the practice of favoring either plan. There is an expected tendency for smaller colleges to do less research.

---

[10] Enrollment data are from *Junior College Directory, 1961. American Association of Junior Colleges, 1961.*

Use of consultants. Twenty-five colleges report using consultants in their programs of institutional research. These are typically employed when expert assistance is needed on some particular study or development, such as making enrollment projections or planning curriculum revisions. Five colleges, however, have a continuing plan for using off-campus experts. Four of these employ a single consultant over a period of years. Under such an arrangement he visits the college several times (in one case monthly) during the year. In contrast, one college reports having an annual visit by a committee of these consultants.

Seven institutions in unified districts report getting research help from "the central office," and four are rendered aid by a state department of education.

Despite this relatively small use of consultants, a number of presidents express an interest in doing so. One observes, "Would like to — but have no funds for this." Another asserts, "We need some leadership from the outside."

Changes planned in programs of institutional research. In response to a question regarding changes planned in organization, twenty-three participants in the survey reported that they anticipated improving their programs (See Table III). Particularly recognized (in a total of eleven replies) are plans for coordinating institutional research: appointing a part-time coordinator, 6 colleges; a full-time coordinator, 1; establishing a staff committee to coordinate, 1; and improving coordination, 3.

TABLE III

PLANS FOR CHANGES IN PROGRAMS OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH REPORTED BY TWENTY-THREE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Changes	Frequency
Make more studies	9
Appoint a part-time coordinator of institutional research	6
Improve coordination of institutional research	3
Formulate a college policy and plan for institutional research	2
Make greater use of consultants	2
Provide additional released time for faculty members to work on institutional research	2
Appoint a full-time coordinator of institutional research	1
Establish a staff committee to coordinate institutional research	1
Provide additional funds for studies by faculty members	1

Although comparatively few report plans for change, such projections as are described should, if carried out, increase both the quantity and value of institutional studies.

Assistance to staff members in studying problems relating to their work. The value of wide staff participation in institutional research is obvious. Stickler, for example, observes:

> Institutional research offices are not agencies unto themselves. Widespread staff participation in institutional research familiarizes the individual with the problems of the college or university, and prepares him to deal realistically and effectively with the research findings.[11]

One means of eliciting faculty participation in research is to provide staff members with assistance in studying problems which are of concern to them. In order to determine the extent to which such aid is given, participants in this survey were asked the following questions:

> Does your college aid staff members who wish to study problems relating to their work (for example, provide technical assistance in planning and conducting research, clerical or secretarial help, released time for making studies)? If yes, please indicate the types of assistance provided.

Sixty-three colleges report providing varied types of such assistance to staff (see Table IV). Most often made available is secretarial or clerical help (thirty-nine colleges). Released time is, upon occasion, granted by twenty colleges and nineteen responses report that technical research assistance is available. The provision of materials needed in conducting research is referred to in ten responses, and financial assistance is mentioned in eight. Special reference to the use of IBM equipment is made in two reports.

TABLE IV

TYPES OF ASSISTANCE SIXTY-THREE JUNIOR COLLEGES PROVIDE STAFF MEMBERS IN STUDYING PROBLEMS RELATING TO THEIR WORK

Types of Assistance	Frequency
Secretarial or clerical	39
Released Time	20
Technical	19
Materials	10
Financial	8
Use of IBM equipment	2

Files of research reports. If the results of research are to be used and if unnecessary duplication of studies is to be avoided, it would seem important to have each college maintain a central file of reports of its studies. Accordingly, this question was included on the inquiry:

> Does your college maintain a central file of all reports of institutional research done on your campus? If yes, what is the name and title of the staff member responsible for these files?

Fifty colleges report having such files and forty-seven indicate that a single officer is responsible for them. At four, however, responsibility for the files is shared by two or three staff members.

Table V indicates that the president keeps the files in thirteen colleges, the dean of instruction in eleven, and the dean of student personnel (or a member of his staff) in nine colleges. Among them, these three major administrative officers keep and organize research reports in more than two-thirds of the colleges which maintain central files. Also designated as having this responsibility are the coordinator of institutional research in five colleges, the librarian in three, and the vice-president in two.

---

[11] Stickler, *op, cit.*, p. 548.

TABLE V
STAFF MEMBER RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING FILES OF RESEARCH REPORTS

Staff Member	Frequency
President	13
Dean of Instruction	11
Dean of Student Personnel, or member of his staff	9
Coordinator of Institutional Research	5
Librarian	3
Vice-President	2
Business Officer	1
Director of Educational Services	1
Director of Public Relations	1
Registrar	1
Not designated	8

Several administrators made comments regarding filing reports of research. One president explained, "When I became president of__________ College four years ago, I asked to see the reports of institutional research studies which had been made during recent years. To my surprise, no files of reports were available; and no one really knew what had been done. You may be sure that we now have an up-to-date file."

In response to the question regarding the maintenance of central files, another administrator replied, "We should and soon will."

A third wrote, "Thanks for sending this inquiry! We do not have a central file but, as a result of your inquiry, will soon have one." This is one of the few occasions, I might note, on which I have been thanked for sending a questionnaire.

B. NATURE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH STUDIES.

As an aid to determining the nature of institutional research in Western junior colleges, participants in the survey were invited to list titles of representative investigations made at their colleges during recent years. Reports of available studies were also requested. Sixty-nine respondents listed 330 titles, and reports of 111 of these were supplied by twenty-five colleges.

The 111 reports were grouped on the basis of the subjects of investigation. Because of the difficulty of determining the nature of studies from titles alone, no attempt was made to classify those for which only these were available. (See Table VI).

TABLE VI
SUBJECTS INVESTIGATED IN INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH STUDIES AT WESTERN JUNIOR COLLEGES

Subject	Present Survey (25)[12]	Sprague (44)[12]	Swanson (6)[12]	Number	Per Cent Total
Students	48	39	72	159	35.4
Curriculum	27	26	45	98	21.9
Enrollment	10	10	30	50	11.1
Faculty	6	27	10	43	9.6
Admission	6	4	20	30	6.7
Plant	4	16	8	28	6.2
Administration and Organization of Institution	5	8	5	18	4.0
Relationships with Outside Agencies	2	1	7	10	2.2
Finance	3	4	0	7	1.6
Teaching	0	5	1	6	1.3
Total	111	140	198	449	100.0

To supplement the findings of the present survey, a tabulation was made (and included in Table VI) of the studies which Western junior colleges reported to Sprague in 1959.[13] Also included in Table VI is a frequency classification of studies identified by Swanson in his 1961 analysis of 198 reports of institutional research at Los Angeles junior colleges.[14]

These three surveys included a total of 449 institutional studies in Western junior colleges.

Students. The largest number of studies in any category (a rank of first in each of the three surveys) are those relating to students. These comprise more than one-third (35.4 per cent) of the total reported. Representative of investigations of this type are "A Survey of the Academic Performance of First-Time Freshmen Students Who Ranked in the Lowest Quartile of their High School Graduating Classes" (Phoenix College); "Changing Nature of Students" (City College of San Francisco); and "Student Employment Survey" (Contra Costa College).

Curriculum. Curriculum studies rank second in frequency and account for more than one-fifth of those reported. Included in this category are "Electronic Computer Survey" (Orange Coast College); "A Survey of Two-Year Terminal-Occupational Offerings in the Junior Colleges of Wyoming" (Northwest Community College, Wyoming), "How Los Angeles City Schools are Meeting Responsibilities for Post-High School Vocational Education" (Division of Extension and Higher Education, Los Angeles City Schools); and "Physical Education Survey," (Fresno City College)

Enrollment. Eleven per cent of the studies relate to enrollment. From Sheridan College, Wyoming, comes such a study and Los Angeles Valley College reports a series of comparative surveys. No study of enrollment projections was submitted in the present survey. Sprague, however, (who included senior colleges and universities as well as two-year colleges) found that enrollment studies were "for the most part, studies of trends, estimates, and projections."[15] Six junior college enrollment projections were reported to Sprague.

---

[12] Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of colleges included in each survey.

[13] Hall T. Sprague. *op cit.* pp. 29-68.

[14] Herbert L. Swanson. *op. cit.* p. 27.

Faculty. Less than ten per cent of the studies included in the three surveys here summarized deal with the faculty and only six of the 111 in the present survey may be so classified. These include one on teaching load at Los Angeles Harbor College and one on "Salary Criteria for Vocational Instructors in Selected California Junior Colleges" made at El Camino College.

Admission. Almost seven per cent of the reports makes a continuing analysis of applications for admission as an aid to forecasting areas of enrollment and staff requirements. Fullerton College reports a study of applicants who failed to register and also a survey of items of information about entering students which California junior colleges obtain.

Plant. Studies of plant (comprising 6 per cent of those surveyed) include some concerned with plans for future buildings and others with utilization of currently-available space. Representative of studies of the former type is one reported by Ricks College: "Physical Science Building Program Requirements for 3,000 Students." Los Angeles Harbor College reports a five-year survey of room utilization.

Organization and Administration of Institution. Relatively few studies of the organization and administration of institutions are reported. Pueblo Junior College reports plans for a self-study of college administration and Olympic College a study of aims and objectives.

Relationships with Outside Agencies. Some studies concern the relationship of a college to its community, for example, "Los Angeles Pierce College Serves Its Community." "Hospital Survey" at Fresno City College was made as an aid to arriving at a decision on establishing a two-year program for the preparation of nurses.

Finance. Little attention is given to finance in studies submitted for the present survey. Chaffey College sends two studies of junior college finance in California, and the Los Angeles Junior College District has studied adult education tuition fees.

Teaching. Least frequently reported in the three surveys here summarized are studies of teaching. None was submitted for the present survey; and only one ("Analysis of Remedial Instruction for Low Ability Students" at Los Angeles City College) was included in Swanson's summary of institutional research in Los Angeles Junior Colleges. Although Sprague classifies five junior college studies under "Teaching Methods," only one of these ("Experimental Study of T.V. Teaching and T.V. Production" at Pueblo Junior College) would appear to be directly related to teaching procedures.[16] Three of the other four are studies of testing and grading and the fourth is an investigation of the distribution of class sizes.

The minimal attention given to investigations of teaching is particularly striking in view of the fact that the junior college is basically a teaching institution. The report of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, for example, asserts:

---

[15] Sprague. *op. cit.* p. 23.

[16] Sprague. *op. cit.* pp. 66-68.

The junior colleges will consider themselves instructional institutions with work confined to the lower division; hence, research should be directed toward improving instruction.[17]

C. SUGGESTIONS FOR CONFERENCE PROGRAM.

Participants in this survey were invited to make suggestions for the program of the present conference. Twenty respondents to this invitation made nine different proposals, several of which (as will be noted from examining Table VII) were adopted in planning the program. The various suggestions made are here singled out for comment because it is believed that they may be helpful in identifying some of the problems which concern junior college administrators as they consider the development of programs of institutional research.

Most often mentioned (six times) are methods for disseminating the findings of studies. Three respondents express an interest in ways of justifying the costs of institutional research, and a like number in effective types for its organization. Two suggested considering the adoption of consistent terminology in reporting junior college statistics, and two also proposed discussion of means of encouraging effective use of the findings of such research.

Other topics proposed were types of research in which a college should engage continuously, i.e. year after year; values of and methods for cooperative research by two or more colleges; comparison of effectiveness of a full-time versus a part-time director of research; and of coordination by a committee versus that by an individual.

An examination of these various proposals for the program of the conference suggests a particular concern for and interest in the exchange and use of the findings of institutional research, effective types of organization, and means of justifying its costs.

TABLE VII

TOPICS SUGGESTED FOR CONSIDERATION AT CONFERENCE ON INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Topics	Frequency
Plans for the exchange and dissemination of research findings among junior colleges	6
How to justify the costs of institutional research	3
Effective types of organization for institutional research	3
The adoption of consistent terminology in reporting junior college statistics	2
Means of encouraging the effective use of the findings of institutional research studies	2
Types of research in which a college should engage continuously—year after year	1
Values of and methods of cooperative research by two or more colleges	1
Value of a full-time versus a part-time director of research	1
Value of having a coordinating committee for institutional research versus having an individual serve as coordinator of research	1

---

[17] State of California. *Master Plan for Higher Education*. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Sacramento, 1960. p. 210.

D. CONCLUSION.

Up to the present my presentation has been based upon the findings of a survey of institutional research in which responses were received from one hundred Western junior colleges. I have also drawn upon selected findings of surveys by Sprague and Swanson.[18]

Among the conclusions which can be drawn from the present survey are the following, some of which are supported by Sprague and Swanson:

1. Junior colleges engage in considerable institutional research.

2. The amount of institutional research varies widely from college to college, with more than one-fourth of the colleges reporting "little research."

3. Less than one-third of the colleges have even part-time coordinators of research. Many—and apparently most— two-year colleges, give only casual attention to the organization for and conduct of institutional research.

4. Consultants are seldom used as aids to junior college programs of institutional research.

5. Only half of the colleges maintain central files for reports of institutional research.

6. It appears that comparatively few faculty members participate in institutional research.

7. A number of administrators express concern about justifying the costs of institutional research.

8. Although little evidence was assembled regarding use of the findings of institutional studies, several respondents express a need for encouraging the effective use of such findings.

9. A number of administrators point out the importance of disseminating the findings of studies made by junior colleges.

10. Although a wide range of problems and subjects are investigated, instruction and methods of teaching are notably neglected.

11. It is not the purpose of the present survey to appraise the quality of institutional research in Western junior colleges. It is, however, impossible to examine the 111 reports assembled in this survey without having some impressions regarding the quality of studies made in the participating colleges. An eleventh conclusion may, therefore, be stated as follows:

> Both the quality of research and the effectiveness of reporting varies widely from college to college. In all too many colleges the quality of research is distinctly inferior.

As I have assembled the findings and conclusions of this survey—and particularly as I have noted some of the current difficulties and problems in formulating and organizing junior college programs of institutional research—my memories have returned to Stephens College where I served as dean of instruction for more than twenty years.

A central element in the four-sentence statement of Stephens College philosophy and practice was this assertion: "The College is committed to research and experimentation in developing its program." In accord with this commitment the Research Service of the college was recognized as a unit of basic importance. In order to infuse the research viewpoint into every phase of the program, the work of the Service was decentralized. Instead of depending upon a small central staff to carry it on, the Service encouraged and helped all members of the faculty to apply the techniques of research to the study of their particular problems. During the two years from 1947 to 1949, for example, 140 projects, carried out by more than 250 students and faculty, were calendared for investigation. Some idea of the variety of these studies may be suggested by listing a few titles:

---

[18] Hall T. Sprague. *op. cit.*

[18] Herbert L. Swanson. *op. cit.*

The status of the superior student at Stephens College.

Classroom honesty—an investigation by a student committee.

The development of an occupational index of alumnae.

The construction of manuals for the training of students who work in dining rooms as waitresses.

A study of the cost of textbooks and other materials students are required to buy for the various courses in the curriculum.

A study of the effectiveness of the opaque projector in teaching students to interpret test profiles.

A study of student achievement in elementary French classes meeting five hours per week.

Diagnostic testing as a basis for teaching speech.

Each of these studies developed from a persistent and unsolved problem, a felt need in the study of which the assistance of the Research Service was elicited. The value and importance of decentralization of the type which I have described is suggested by Kurt Lewin's assertion that "... the extent to which social research is translated into social action depends on the degree to which those who carry out this action are made a part of the fact-finding on which the action is based."[19]

An important factor in the development of the Stephens program was the faculty's knowledge that the Director of the Research Service—whether he was a full-time member of the staff, or, as was usual, a consultant who came to campus several times a year—was available to each of them for help in planning and carrying out studies.

One device which was used in designing and scheduling studies, as well as in developing the central research file, was the Problem Statement Blank. On this sheet would be recorded the project number (60-42, for example, would for filing purposes designate project number 42 in the 1960-61 college year), title of the study, purpose of the study, and methods of procedure. Under methods would be listed not only steps in the investigation but typically, also the date at which it was anticipated that each step would be completed.

The Stephens College plan of research was completely voluntary—no faculty member was coerced into participation. But, I must assert, it was highly stimulating, often bringing out the "eager beaver" in those of us on the staff. Quite consistently, as problems arose or issues were raised, as off-the-cuff decisions were presented, the injunction of the Director of Research would be, "Let's get the facts, and let's study them."

As I contemplate the current status of institutional research in Western junior colleges and as I hark back to developments at Stephens College, it seems clear that some of the practices there may aid other programs to expand quantitatively; to strengthen qualitatively; and particularly to translate findings into action—as a consequence of wide faculty and student participation undergirded by expert guidance and assistance. These directions can be, I am convinced, centrally important in developing effective programs of institutional research in our junior colleges.

---

[19] Kurt Lewin. *Resolving Social Conflicts.* Harper, 1948. p. 68.

SYMPOSIUM: INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Institutional Research at Orange Coast College

JAMES H. NELSON, *Administrative Dean, Institutional Research*
Orange Coast College

Heretofore at Orange Coast College the organization for institutional research has been decentralized with research being done by various persons and committees. However, effective July 1, 1961 a new position of Administrative Dean-Research was created and with the addition of this full-time person, the organization will become centralized.

The appointment of a full-time person to an institutional research position is, to the best of my knowledge, without precedent in a junior college. Even highly touted Stephens College has ordinarily had a research director who served on a part-time basis. The following statement of the duties and responsibilities for this new position may therefore be of interest:

1. Under the direction of the District Superintendent and President to develop and conduct a comprehensive program of research.
2. Organize and conduct a continuous program for evaluating the instructional program of Orange Coast College.
3. Be sensitive to the needs for research and evaluation of the college including its educational and fiscal operation.
4. Coordinate existing research studies of the college.
5. Assist staff members in organizing and designing needed research studies.
6. Provide data and facts to administrators which will assist in evaluation and decision making.
7. Provide summaries of pertinent research projects carried on by other institutions, individuals or organizations.
8. Organize studies and see that they are regularly made in the following fields and others:
    a) Follow-up on transfer students
    b) Follow-up on occupational majors
    c) Placement of students on jobs
    d) Grading practices
    e) Educational and occupational needs of people and of the area served
    f) Evaluation of different occupational major programs
    g) Effective use of counseling.
9. Teach limited program of classes.

These duties and responsibilities suggest in general the nature of the future institutional research program at Orange Coast College. At present there is little more which can be reported regarding our organization for this purpose except to point out that we will utilize a faculty research advisory committee. It is also our intent to use the facilities and equipment available in our machine records and data processing areas.

Having presented this brief overview, I would now like to review some of the college's research accomplishments to date. From its very inception, Orange Coast College has made institutional research an integral part of its program. A long period of study and planning preceded the establishment of Orange Coast Junior College District and even before the College opened its doors for instruction in 1948, it had cooperated with the other junior colleges in the county and with the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools in a study of the *Products and By-Products of Orange County Education.*

From this study some definite inferences could be drawn. For example, counseling and guidance services assumed greater importance as a result of discovering that forty-seven per cent of the high school juniors and seniors surveyed had made no vocational choices and that student occupational interests and job opportunities in Orange County did not correlate well. Other findings pointed the way for curricular development and for a strong public relations program.

Study of the Community's educational and occupational needs has proved to be the major current in the stream of institutional research at Orange Coast College. In 1954 a comprehensive study was made of the *Educational and Occupational Needs of Coastal Area Orange County.* Again, survey results suggested the directions for the development of curricula, building plans, counseling, and other facets of the college program.

In 1958 Orange Coast College joined with Santa Ana and Fullerton Colleges and the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools in conducting an *Occupational Survey of Orange County.* As before, the resulting data were utilized in arriving at administrative decisions.

More recently the junior colleges of Orange County requested the Orange County Committee on School District Organization to make a master plan study for junior college organization in the county. This recommendation was approved by the Committee and a team of experts was employed to conduct the survey. The comprehensive report which has been prepared and published under the title *A Study of the Junior College Needs of Orange County 1960-1980,* contains such sobering statements as the following:

1. In 1960 Orange County's junior colleges enrolled 6,300 FTE day students and by 1980 it is estimated that the number will reach 36,000.
2. If Orange County's junior colleges are to remain within the maximum FTE enrollment recommended by the Study Committee (5,000 to 5,500) it will be necessary to increase the number of junior college campuses from the three presently in existence to a total of ten by 1980.
3. The estimated cost of these new campuses is $110,000,000.

Although the Study Committee's report is essentially optimistic about Orange County's fiscal ability to meet junior college educational needs in the years ahead, it certainly leaves no room for doubt about the gargantuan nature of the task and the critical importance of coordinated inter-institutional planning.

Supplementing Orange Coast's mainstream of institutional research have been studies of the educational goals of the college, student characteristics, faculty, curriculum, facilities, administration, finance and public relations. Each of these areas will be commented upon briefly.

Goals. The educational philosophy and objectives of Orange Coast College are periodically evaluated by the faculty, Board of Trustees, administration and Citizens Advisory Committee. Since the philosophy and objectives establish the basis for developing the curriculum, this type of evaluation helps to assure educational programs which are consistent with the purposes of the College. The most recent evaluation of college objectives was made in 1958 at which time the statement of objectives was approved without reservation by 96% of the faculty.

Students. Many studies of students are made at Orange Coast College. In addition to accumulating the usual information on age, sex, geographic origin, etc., studies are made of students' academic aptitude and achievement, course load, grade point average at Orange Coast and at transfer institutions, perseverance and dropout, employment while attending college, participation in extra-class activities, and job placement.

A recent study of dropouts at Orange Coast College revealed a relatively high incidence among non-high school graduates, night students, enrollees in occupational curricula, students enrolled for less than twelve units, and students employed forty hours or more per week.

Faculty. Research on faculty includes work on teaching effectiveness, salary studies, teaching loads and faculty grading practices. Some work has also been done on the use of mechanical and auto-instructional teaching aids. The college has initiated research on the comparative efficacy of teaching computer arithmetic by means of the Mark II Autotutor versus the conventional classroom-lecture method. A report on this study is being prepared now and an extension of the study is planned for next year.

Of special significance is the college program in "Large Class Instruction," a plan evolved from ideas conceived in a summer workshop of faculty and administrators which was aimed at gearing the college to an expanded enrollment. The present program utilizes a specially designed Forum Building seating 300 and costing $180,000. All of the evidence at hand confirms the success of this endeavor and its further expansion is probable.

There has been other faculty interest and action research. Dr. Moore, Dean of Instruction, has before him now an interesting proposal for utilizing a teaching machine (or variant thereof) in developing a Writing Clinic. The programmed subject matter would focus upon grammar, punctuation and spelling in an attempt to free English teachers from drill on mechanics.

Curriculum. As previously pointed out, the impact from surveys of community needs were reflected almost immediately in the college curriculum. Three specific examples of curricular modification resulting from such studies are the introduction of Agri-Business, expansion and revision of the program in electronics, and organization of an instructional program in Business Data Processing. The latter has been developed as a pilot project under the National Defense Education Act and with the assistance of the Bureau of Business Education, California Department of Education. The two-year curriculum in Data Processing which is being developed at Orange Coast may be used by the U.S. Office of Education as a model program.

Facilities. The research which led to development of the Forum Program in large class instruction and to preparation of the Report on Junior College Needs of Orange County 1960-1980 are both examples of studies relating to college facilities. The surveys of library usage and classroom utilization are further examples of efforts in this direction.

Administration. As a result of study in this area a new administrative post in institutional research was created. Other organizational changes which have occurred from time to time were based upon analysis of the administrative plan then in operation.

Finance. Those of you who know Dr. Peterson (and who in junior college education doesn't) know also of his successful development of Orange Coast College on a "pay-as-you-go" basis. You need no reassurance that research is conducted on all aspects of the college's fiscal operation. As a matter of fact, Orange Coast has for a number of years prepared and distributed a report on the ability and effort of California public junior colleges to finance their programs of instruction. With the current and impending growth of our college there will doubtless be intensification of present research on fiscal matters.

Public relations. Recurrent surveys of community needs, the development of an active Faculty Speakers' Bureau, the sponsorship of many community events, the use of citizen advisory committees and a host of other evidences bespeak awareness of the importance of public relations at Orange Coast. Many of these developments have been influenced by the results of institutional research. Attendance at college-sponsored community events, quantity and quality of college coverage in the local press and frequent use of the Faculty Speaker's Bureau all indicate successful public relations.

In summary, I think it can be seen that research has played an important role at Orange Coast College. The creation of a new full-time research position reflects our belief in the importance of this function as well as our determination to effectively fulfill it.

Institutional Research at El Camino College

Stuart E. Marsee

President, El Camino College

Institutional Research grows out of the need to obtain necessary data to make intelligent and objective decisions regarding immediate or anticipated problems and difficulties. Generally speaking, the difficulty must concern a considerable number of people to justify the time and effort involved in research. To keep from falling into the common mistake of making the area of investigation so broad that the final report is an endless compilation of generalities leading to nothing, it is most important to delimit or to try to solve a carefully defined problem or difficulty.

El Camino College has had from its inception (fourteen years ago) a young and inquisitive faculty membership. As the college and faculty grow older there is no tangible evidence that curiosity is diminishing. Much independent, departmental, and institutional study has occurred during the brief history of the institution. However, when the accreditation team arrived on the steps of the institution two years ago there was little evidence, in terms of available reports, to verify completed research.

Obviously, one of the most apparent needs of El Camino College was to assign an individual not only to carry out research for a large and expanding institution, but also to assemble, catalog, and provide a depository for the varied research relative to the institution done by different groups and individuals at the college.

Accordingly, in 1959 a part-time Coordinator of Research was appointed. He makes studies, aids others in their research, and maintains a file of reports of all completed studies. He also sends a list of completed research projects to all faculty members each year.

Although the Coordinator of Research is administratively responsible to the Director of Instruction, the Director of Student Personnel, the Director of Business, and the President of the College have equal call on his time.

The problem of determining priority of research is very real. Accordingly a clearing committee, which consists of three directors, the Coordinator, and the President, was formed to aid in determining the need of research and to approve each project prior to its inception. This committee serves as a "buffer" for the coordinator, provides an opportunity to define and to delimit problems to be explored and acts, in review, as a "sounding board" for the coordinator while research is in progress.

The range and type of institutional research at El Camino College is suggested by the following list of studies which have been completed during the past two years:

Criteria for Determining the Salaries of Vocational Instructors in Selected California Junior Colleges. Jack Cooper, 1959.

A comparison of Academic Degrees Held by Faculty Members of El Camino College with Those of Three Private and Three State Colleges. William Davies, Jr., Hamilton M. Maddaford, 1959.

The Preparation and Employment of Teachers of Vocational Subjects in Selected California Junior Colleges. Jack Cooper, 1960.

Compensation for Master Teachers. Jack Cooper, 1960.

A Forecast of Enrollment for El Camino College, 1960-1970. Jack Cooper, 1960.

Room Utilization Survey-Fall Semester, 1959. G. W. Brown, 1960.

The Achievement of El Camino College Pre-Engineering Students as Measured by their Success on the Upper Division Engineering Entrance Examination of the University of California at Los Angeles. Ernest Cohen, 1960.

Class Size in California Public Junior Colleges. Jack Cooper, 1960.

Assignment of Teacher Time by Departments, Spring, 1960. Jack Cooper, 1960.

Community Services Provided by Junior College Libraries in California. Jack Cooper, 1960.

A Comparison of Two Methods of Teaching an Engineer Slide Rule Course. Robert Maier, 1960.

The Compensation of Substitute Instructors in Selected Junior Colleges. Jack Cooper, 1960.

A Survey of Education for Adults within the El Camino Junior College District. Jack Cooper, 1960.

Study of Graduates of 1959. Leo Christian, 1960.

Survey of Office Workers in Manufacturing and Industrial Businesses in the City of Torrance. Fern McCoard, 1960.

Practices Concerning Junior College Bands. Jack Cooper, 1960.

Junior College Dropouts with Certain Data for El Camino College. Jack Cooper, 1960.

An Analysis of the Performance of Students Enrolled in Chemistry 1A at El Camino College during the Fall, 1957, through Spring, 1960. Leo E. Kallan and William T. Mooney, Jr., 1960.

Teacher Load for Fall Semesters, 1958, 1959 and 1960. Sidney W. Bingham, 1960.

Teaching Space Needs at El Camino College. Sidney W. Bingham, 1960.

A Report on Local Norms for the Brown-Holtzman Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes. Robert T. Franklin, 1960.

Administrative Salary Study. Edward L. Bingham, 1960.

Fringe Benefits for Faculty Members in California Junior Colleges. Edward L. Schwartz, 1961.

Some institutional research — at El Camino College and elsewhere — reveals a somewhat "loose" interpretation of the term "research." If, by definition, all research must have a high degree of reliability and validity, many institutional studies fail to qualify. On the other hand, it is essential to recognize that the extent and nature of an investigation must bear some reasonable relationship to the importance of the problem being studied and to the limitations of time available — before, for example, a conclusion must be reached as a basis for action.

Recognizing that administrative decisions — if they are to be intelligent and hopefully objective — must be concerned with factual data — the results of institutional research at El Camino College have justified its cost.

Institutional Research in the Junior Colleges of Los Angeles

WALTER T. COULTAS, *Assistant Superintendent,*
Division of Extension and Higher Education,
Los Angeles City Junior College District.

In October, 1960, a small group — including several in attendance here today — met in my office to review reports of institutional studies from Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles Valley College, and the Central Office of the Los Angeles Junior College District. All of us present were impressed with the variety, scope, and value of the studies reported and felt that consideration of programs and plans for institutional research would be most valuable for any junior college. It is my understanding that this conference is in part an outgrowth of that earlier meeting.

One direct result of last fall's discussions was the preparation — by Herbert L. Swanson, a graduate student in the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program — of a catalog of institutional research done in the Los Angeles Junior College District.[20] In his report Swanson classified under nine headings the 198 reports submitted by the seven junior colleges in the District under the following categories: students, curriculum, enrollment, admission, faculty, plant, relationship with outside agencies, administration and organization of institution, and teaching. Since these studies were made in the individual junior colleges and since finance is administered by the Central Office of the District, it is not surprising that no studies of finance were submitted.

As a result of Mr. Swanson's survey it was clear that, although a significant number of important studies had been made, the findings of investigations were seldom known outside of the particular colleges in which they were made. Accordingly it was agreed that we, in the Los Angeles Junior College District, should take steps to centralize the results of the studies carried out in our junior colleges. A sharing of findings would be invaluable to all.

With this in mind, a meeting of the presidents of Los Angeles junior colleges was devoted to a consideration of institutional research. As a result, each college now has an individual who serves as coordinator of institutional research on his campus. The position of this person varies from college to college. At one, an instructor (in psychology, for example) may serve as coordinator and, at another, an administrator may have coordination as part of his responsibilities. Some colleges have faculty research committees; others have none. In several colleges reports of studies are centralized in a dean's office; in some, however, reports are filed in the office of the departments most directly concerned with their results.

Despite varying practices in the organization and administration of institutional research in our seven colleges, there is unanimity of agreement in certain areas:

1. Research is the responsibility of all — not simply that of the coordinator alone. Regardless of plans which are used, efforts must be made

---

[20] Herbert L. Swanson, "Surveys of Institutional Research in Los Angeles Junior Colleges." (unpublished manuscript.) Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1961.

not to over-formalize the process to the extent of inhibiting any individual wishing to make a particular study.

2. Instructors should be actively encouraged to study the various facets of their teaching. This can lead to increased creativity and improved instruction.

3. Since the coordinator is an adviser, he must have the confidence and respect of the group with which he works. He assists in the design and validation of a study but does not stifle the enthusiasm which engendered it. He holds in professional confidence the findings of studies which are available to him as coordinator.

4. The coordinator should give leadership to any college-wide research activity.

5. The president of each college has final authority regarding dissemination of the findings of studies made on his campus.

6. Wider circulation and publicity should be given to reports of institutional research in Los Angeles junior colleges. This should include articles in professional journals as well as the occasional publication of special bulletins or monographs.

An important step in coordinating research in the junior colleges of Los Angeles will be taken when, beginning in September, reports of all studies will be sent to the Central Office of the District for cataloging and filing. Periodically a bibliography of reports submitted will be distributed to our seven junior colleges.

Los Angeles junior colleges have made a significant number of institutional studies. Under the plans which we have formulated we can anticipate increased use of the findings of our research as well as a possible improvement in the quality of our studies, and increase in the quantity.

Institutional Research at American River Junior College

AUDREY G. MENEFEE, *Assistant to the President,*
American River Junior College

During the 1961-62 college year, those of us at American River Junior College will be analyzing and raising critical questions regarding varied data gathered during the first six years of our college operation. We also propose to expand our work in institutional research.

Up to the present such studies as we have made have largely been limited to those concerning our students and our community.

At American River, studies of student characteristics — to which we add a new dimension whenever the tools permit—are carried on primarily to orient the faculty to the kinds of students they are teaching, and to help us in curriculum development. Faculty members are made acquainted with the means, modes, and range of the School and College Ability Test and English placement examination scores; the sex and age distribution of the student body; the proportion of students who plan to transfer and the proportion who are in technical vocational programs; the number of students who have part-time and full-time jobs; and the like. An example of the use of these studies in curriculum development emerged from the findings that a sizeable number of our students are pre-teacher majors. As a result of this knowledge we developed a course, Survey of Education.

We make continuing studies of the characteristics and attitudes of students who withdraw from college. On the basis of what we have learned about these students, we have tightened up probation and retention standards, have made rearrangements in counseling loads, and have reduced the amount of time allowed for late registration. We also explore the reasons that students offer for leaving college, and act upon those reasons that appear to us to be valid. We have consequently strengthened the health program and have increased our job placement services by providing office space for a full-time representative of the State Department of Employment. Also, as a result of our studies, counselors are advising students to drop single courses before the quality of their work becomes so low that it is necessary for them to drop out of college.

Since 1958 we have made follow-up studies of our graduates eleven months after their Commencement. In these surveys former students are queried about their present employment and its relation to their work at American River. They are also asked to rate the college counseling service and the instructional and activity program.

During the past college year we completed our second occupational needs survey. Conducted to determine what job training is most in demand in our area and what education beyond high school is needed to meet these demands, pertinent information was obtained concerning ten major occupational categories. Particularly sought were answers to the questions: Who will be needed and how ought we to train the technician who is to be effective in the 1965 labor market?

Supplementing our community survey is a study of the socio-economic background of our students which has revealed a shift in the composition of the student body amounting almost to a mutation. In a population that has tripled in the past ten years, and whose economic base has changed from a farm economy to one dominated by the missile industry, two-thirds of our students are recent arrivals to the area.

Plans for the organization and administration of institutional research at American River Junior College are being formulated this summer — with assistance received at this conference and at a workshop on junior college administration at the University of California at Berkeley. A qualified member of the staff will be put on a part-time assignment to keep abreast of trends and developments in higher education, especially in the junior college, and to assist the faculty in formulating and carrying out individual and group studies. Members of the staff will be encouraged to study problems and developments which are of interest to them and, whenever possible, the college will provide materials and clerical and bibliographical assistance as well as the use of IBM equipment

A calendar of projects and of progress on them will be maintained in a central office, along with a file of reports of all completed studies undertaken at the college. Plans for a number of developments and studies have been made and others are under consideration.

In the area of instruction, we hope to start with some controlled attempts to test hypotheses concerning methods of teaching both remedial and honors courses in English, mathematics, and languages. The psychology department is exploring the possibility of an experiment with team-instruction. To prepare for a sharply expanded student body, we are encouraging divisions to try out larger classes.

During the 1961-62 college year we will initiate a so-called Opportunity Program on a limited pilot basis. In this we will develop courses and counseling planned particularly for failure-prone students, including both those who are poorly motivated and those who have low aptitude. Through our work in this area we hope to get information on the basis of which we can make more valid judgments regarding which applicants are really "capable of profiting from instruction."

We propose to continue and refine our follow-up studies of graduates. As an aid to circumventing the bias of sampling and the necessary brevity of responses that characterize studies based on postcard returns, we propose to supplement our usual survey with a series of personal interviews.

In studying our community we hope to initiate a continuous survey as well as, at intervals, to make thorough studies of particular problems and developments.

In our area, where potential parkways and open spaces have been covered with concrete highways and tract homes, and where cultural facilities are scarce, we have accepted the responsibility of providing campus facilities whenever their use by community groups does not interfere with instruction. During the 1960-61 college year, our facilities were used by 30,000 residents who met on the campus in some five hundred separate groups. As a part of our community studies we will evaluate the results of our generous policy regarding the community use of our facilities.

In the area of institutonal organization, the college continues to try out changes in structure, and to seek the most workable definitions of personnel functions. One staff member will spend half of his time helping to clarify the role of the college to high school personnel and students, and another will spend full time working with the college faculty to strengthen weak spots and in general to maintain high standards of instruction.

Our interests in institutional research are immediate and practical. Current developments at American River plus plans for the future — in instruction, in community relations, in institutional organization, and in other areas of operation not referred to in this brief presentation — provide an opportunity and a need for institutional research. Institutional studies will contribute to continuing improvement in the education of our students.

Institutional Research in Washington Junior Colleges

GEORGE HODSON, *Dean,*
Skagit Valley Junior College

In the state of Washington, in the Skagit Valley, and at home I have the reputation of being a devout radical on most matters. Every once in a while, however, I surprise myself and my colleagues by extremely reactionary leanings in some areas. In the case of "organization for institutional research," I fear that I shall bluntly have to rely on what I believe is my true nature — ultra-conservatism.

I have been asked to report briefly on the organizational features of institutional research in Washington junior colleges. Since I am particularly familiar with my own college, I shall devote most of my attention to it; I shall, however, also report on my nearest neighbor, Everett Junior College.

At Skagit Valley College, a medium-sized public-supported community college serving parts of northwest Washington, institutional research is and should be an incidental feature of our over-all program. It is all very well to say that a great deal of research needs to be done — true, it does! I frankly believe, however, that this should be a function of agencies other than the junior college itself: Departments of higher education in universities (if they are aware of and interested in the development of junior colleges in the state — and some of them obviously have not been), the American Association of Junior Colleges, regional and state associations, and state and county departments of public instruction.

Junior colleges are first and foremost teaching institutions, not research organizations. Let's stick to the job at hand. We have all been doing pretty well in improving our services, strengthening our instructional programs, serving our communities, and keeping up with the growth — as well as planning for the future. In a very real sense all of this involves research though it may not be formally referred to as such. Knowing what is going on in the junior college world and keeping our institutions abreast of the times occupies a fairly large portion of our time as administrators. Dr. Merson and Dr. Mayhew have pointed out the importance of this part of our job. Yes, it certainly is important: To go through a comprehensive institutional self-analysis regularly (as we do in Washington), to be aware of the tide of students already upon us, to ascertain their and the community's and the nation's needs in our segment of higher education — these are necessary.

In-service programs for faculty, their and administrators' attendance at conferences and workshops, local workshops for purposes of orientation of new faculty, and a re-evaluation of work being done by faculty members — this is just about as far as we can and should go. Let's keep our perspective before we formalize our research programs. Let's keep our heads, not trying to ape the universities with their foundation grants, and with their best talent devoted to research, but in many cases with all too little talent, time, and funds left over for carrying on quality instructional programs.

We should do as little as necessary in a *formal* organizational pattern for a *formal* research program. Let us encourage our faculty members to keep up with their own fields of teaching and to recognize their place in the instructional program whether they be working primarily in pre-transfer, professional preparation, general education, or vocational-techni-

cal preparation for a specific job. Let us evaluate ourselves regularly as an institution, a job for everyone in the organization plus the outside professional evaluator. Let us be appreciative of past successes and errors in junior college history; let us be aware of present practices, experimentation, and resources; let us keep an eye open to what the future is likely to hold for us; *but,* let us not institute offices of research, directors of research, and more committees. Let us use common sense!

Now that I have expounded rather negatively on institutional research, I should point out that, at Skagit Valley this past year, we conducted some forty separate studies relating to instruction and administration at our college.

I am also pleased to pass on to you a report from Everett Junior College. Fred Giles, president of that college, writes in part as follows:

> **Everett Junior College has been carrying on a program in institutional research for several years. At the present it has developed into several parts we hope to coordinate into an office of institutional research.**
>
> **In our November, 1960, *Newsletter* in discussing this topic, I stated:**
>
> **"It becomes very important that profound research be brought to bear upon decisions made in our colleges. An important part of the general program should be organized institutional fact-finding. Examples of some of the things we should know are:**
>
> **(1) The image of our student body;**
> **(2) What effect our College has had on its students;**
> **(3) How well we are carrying out our objectives;**
> **(4) How well our stated objectives match the needs of the community;**
> **(5) The effectiveness of our instruction.**
>
> **"These are just a few of the possibilities for research projects. Detailed studies should be made of all the many and varied facets of our institution, faculty, and student body.**
>
> **"To accomplish this goal, I believe we should establish an office of institutional study and research at Everett Junior College. The functions of such an office would be to:**
>
> **(1) Coordinate existing studies;**
> **(2) Initiate new studies;**
> **(3) Assist in developing study designs for staff members;**
> **(4) Provide data to administrators to assist them in their functions of evaluation and decision-making;**
> **(5) Furnish detailed information for research projects being carried on by other institutions, individuals or organizations."**

I have presented our Skagit Valley plan of engaging in little formalized research and yet, I feel, doing the job that needs to be done within the limitations of an institution with the purposes of a junior college. In contrast, I have reported President Giles' views regarding the need for a formalized office of institutional research. It may well be that neither Skagit Valley nor Everett has the whole truth. Perhaps the best answer to the problem of institutional research lies at a point between the positions which I have suggested.

Institutional Research at City College of San Francisco

THOMAS F. NESBITT, *Director,*
Testing, Research, and Guidance, City College of San Francisco

The City College of San Francisco is an exponent of institutional research. We are interested in an active program of curricular research for the primary purpose of improving instruction. While we recognize the need for other kinds of research related to finance, classroom usage, building needs, etc., we feel that studies directed toward the improvement of the curriculum and instruction and toward the measurement of student achievement are of primary importance. Administrative research dealing with finance and building needs is carried out by the Division of Educational Management at the college and by the Central Office of the San Francisco Unified School District, of which City College is an integral part. The Bureau of Research of the Unified School District supervises testing and research for the elementary and secondary schools. Since research at City College is separate and apart from the Bureau of Research, we have our own Office of Testing, Research and Guidance and have established research procedures to meet our needs.

One person, the Director of Testing, Research and Guidance, has been assigned the responsibility for supervising curricular and student personnel research at City College. His staff includes a counselor assigned to research duty on a one-third time basis and a full-time clerk-secretary. In addition, from four to six students, employed as laboratory assistants at $1.35 per hour, work on research for a total of approximately twenty hours per week. Each department in the college has a research representative who serves as a liaison with the Office of Research.

When a problem develops in a particular department (a high drop-out rate in Chemistry 1A, for example) faculty members and/or the department representative meet with the Director of Research to plan a study designed to determine what is happening and why, and to furnish data on the basis of which possible solutions to the problem may be achieved. The project is planned cooperatively and responsibilities allotted for the gathering of the required data. At times data are collected exclusively by the Director and his staff, at times exclusively by the department, and at other times in part by each. The Director reports findings of the study to faculty members involved and to the deans, and the department staff decides on a course of action.

Faculty members are encouraged to bring their problems to the Director of Research for investigation. The research reports are discussed by the individual department faculty members, by the counseling staff, and by the entire faculty occasionally. The aim is to involve the members of the faculty concerned with a project, to furnish them with data so that they may arrive at a tentative solution, and then to test this tentative solution to determine its effectiveness.

The Office of Testing and Research has the services of extensive IBM equipment. This facilitates the collection of certain kinds of data. Every student entering City College completes a battery of tests, the scores on which are IBM treated and recorded in the Office of Testing and Research. Any study requiring the ability scores of students is thus facilitated by having these data readily available.

Perhaps the best way to explain the organization of our institutional research program is to discuss a particular problem which the English department faced. For several years new students have been assigned to English courses on the basis of their scores on entrance examinations. The English department felt a need for determining how our classification system, based on standardized objective tests, compared with that at the University of California at Berkeley, where an essay examination plan is used. The department wanted to be assured that the students eligible for our English 1A course were equivalent to those eligible for the same course at Berkeley. A committee consisting of the head of the English department, the dean of instruction, a member of the English department faculty and the Director of Testing and Research was, therefore, formed and a plan for study developed. Under this plan some 150 of our entering students took both our regular entrance tests and the Subject A examination (objective and essay) from the University. These latter tests were scored by the University of California staff of readers and the results reported to our college. The staff of the Research Office then treated the data comparing the PASS-FAIL performance on our test with the PASS-FAIL performance of the Berkeley tests.

A tetrachoric coefficient of correlation was calculated as well as several zero-order linear coefficients relating various scores on our tests with those of Berkeley. On the basis of the report prepared by the Research Office, the English department has made certain changes in scores on our classification system. The study revealed that we can assign our students to English classes on the basis of objective examinations and yet achieve results similar to those at Berkeley where an essay examination is used.

Much of our institutional research has involved the development of procedures for screening students for admission to selected courses and curriculums. For the Fall of 1961 we have had two hundred applications for forty spaces in our new two-year program in nursing. In our program in dental technology we have approximately fifty applicants of whom we can admit only twenty. The only fair procedure to follow in these cases is to screen applicants in order to admit to crowded programs those students who have the best chance to succeed. This demands information concerning what is necessary for success in these curriculums. This is a problem to which we shall address ourselves through our program of institutional research.

The nature of research at City College is further suggested by the following list of representative research studies which have been made during the past three years:

(1) A follow-up study of Fall 1957 transfers to San Francisco State College and to the University of California at Berkeley;

(2) A study of engineering, science, and mathematics majors who transferred to Berkeley;

(3) A study of gains in achievement made by students enrolled in basic classes in communications and business arithmetic;

(4) Follow-up studies of students who had completed two-year curriculums in photography and recreational leadership;

(5) A study of the performance of low ability students as indicated by SCAT scores;

(6) A study of grading trends in our college, over-all as well as by major departments;

(7) A study of the changing nature of our entering students as revealed by entrance test scores.

In conclusion, institutional research at City College of San Francisco is, then, a cooperative approach to the solution of curricular and student personnel problems through the joint efforts of faculty members, counselors, and administrators. The cooperative approach which we are using results in the wide involvement of staff members and in the study of varied issues, problems, and developments.

Institutional Research at Foothill College

CALVIN C. FLINT, *President, Foothill College*

Foothill College is probably no different from any other new college in its desire to get everything started at once and to do the best job possible in all areas. Our experience of the last three years has, however, demonstrated that some segments of the program must be promoted while others are permitted to lag.

One of the expressed objectives of Foothill College is to carry out extensive institutional research. Our work in this area has, however, been permitted to lag. For this reason I suggested that Foothill College should not be represented on this panel, but we all know how persuasive Lamar can be. So here I am.

Since I have indicated that institutional research is an expressed objective of Foothill College, it would perhaps be appropriate to quote our written board policy on the matter. There are two policy statements relative to research—one negative and one affirmative. The negative statement reads as follows:

> Foothill College, as a public junior college working within the framework of the California Master Plan for Higher Education, is not designated as a research institution and therefore the Board makes no special provision for the encouragement of research by staff members other than institutional analysis and instructional experimentation.

The second policy, the affirmative one, gives direction for further development:

> The administration is authorized to employ, when appropriate, staff adequate to perform analysis which will aid in the functioning of Foothill as a community college. The Board wishes to have institutional studies and experimentation in the following areas: community surveys, student characteristics and follow-ups, instructional improvement, plant utilization, and financial analysis. Other studies which will have benefit for Foothill College may be conducted.
>
> The administration may participate in all regional, state and national studies which appear appropriate and which have reliable sponsors.
>
> All institutional analysis will be reported periodically to the Board.

The Board has demonstrated its desire to implement this policy by authorizing on the College table of organization a full-time Director of Research who is to be employed when the administration believes the time is appropriate.

Foothill made its first timid forward step this last year when it employed Dr. Henry Tyler on a one-tenth time basis to help the College formulate a pattern for research. Dr. Tyler's work has been valuable in helping us formulate a pattern for our research as well as in forcing all of us to stop, think, and plan before rushing off into some research morass.

Although we do not yet have a director of research, we do have a Research Committee which is active in laying a foundation for our future program. The Committee has concluded—and in this we all agree—that if we are to have a research program it is essential to have certain continuing information and facts about the college. With this in mind the committee has prepared a list of data which in its judgment we should continually have available. Although we are not now assembling all of these data, we are considering the committee's recommendations as we plan printed forms and punch cards on which to record data.

The following list includes the major items of information which the committee suggests be continually assembled:

I. Students
  A. Source
    1. Residence
    2. High school of graduation
    3. Year of high school graduation
    4. Previous college experience
  B. Age (breakdown by individual years 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25-29, 30-34, 45 up)
  C. Sex
  D. Marital status
  E. Grade status (freshman, sophomore)
  F. Enrollment (full-time, part-time)
  G. Veteran status
  H. Stated educational objective
    1. Transfer (including name of college)
    2. Nontransfer
    3. Undecided
  I. Intended major
  J. Previous academic record
  K. Test records
  L. Employment — while in college
  M. Foothill grade point average (distribution and College mean)
  N. Follow-up

II. Faculty (certificated staff)
  A. Status
  B. Age
  C. Degrees held
  D. Previous experience
  E. Salary

III. Curriculum
  A. Number of courses
  B. Outline for each course
  C. Enrollment by class

IV. Plant utilization

V. Income and cost
  A. Income
  B. Cost
  C. Cost per student contact hour, by division and course

VI. Summaries to be run each semester
  - A. Distributions, means and standard deviations of entrance tests
  - B. Educational plans, by class groupings of students
  - C. Unit loads for which registered
  - D. Hours-week of outside work, distribution and means
  - E. Distribution of grades, by class and division
  - F. Grade-point average, by division
  - G. Job placements
    1. For part-time work
    2. For full-time work
  - H. Evaluations by employers of working students
  - I. Instructor loads
    1. Student credit hours per week-end of third week; end of semester
    2. Student contact hours per week-end of third week; end of semester
    3. Number of preparations

It is our judgment that assembling data of the type referred to above will be of inestimable value to our program of institutional research.

The Research Committee has also suggested several areas in which study and analysis should have particular value for the College:

1. Community: no broad-scale study of northern Santa Clara County yet made.
2. Instruction:
   Readers as means of aiding and relieving faculty
   Effects of night teaching on day teaching and activity programs
   Should counselors be allowed to teach at night?
   Extent of faculty participation in total program of college
   Teaching methods in relation to efficiency
   Problems of large versus small classes
   The help of television in teaching
   Use of Ampex-tape for self-improvement of faculty
   Realization of general education outcomes.
   Analyses of reasons for failure in class
   What to do with high school probationary students
3. Student characteristics:
   Study of socio-economic levels and occupations of fathers
   Student satisfaction with Foothill College
   Relation between student goals and job opportunities
4. Business: unit costs, annually, as growth occurs
5. Attitudes and images: Foothill College image among community groups, e.g. high school students
6. Enrollment projections
7. Follow-up studies:

My remarks up to the present are largely confined to plans for the future. There are, however, two areas on which we at Foothill College have done some — although certainly limited — work and study. The first is the area of campus planning and the second — though to a lesser extent — instructional improvement.

When planning the campus for Foothill we had two pressures: one was the knowledge that the proper expenditure of $12,000,000 for a new campus is a tremendous responsibility, and the other was the Board's concern about proper utilization of facilities.

Wisely or unwisely I took all Board members and the architects on a ten-day tour of many junior college and four-year college campuses in California. The Board's main impression, in addition to recognizing some fine plants, was that frequently facilities were not being used extensively. We visited campuses where the student could scarcely be found after 2:00 in the afternoon. On one junior college campus we had to have a custodian unlock the door to the science building at 2:00 because there were no more classes scheduled that day. Also we saw many rooms with a capacity of sixty but which contained only twenty-five or thirty chairs.

Consequently, I started a study of what Foothill might need. I obtained the class schedules for three semesters (two fall and one spring) from five junior colleges which were located in a socio-economic area somewhat similar to that of the Foothill District. Next, I obtained the size of classes in the various courses offered in these colleges and compared them with what I thought we would wish class sizes to be at Foothill.

On this basis we determined the number of sections we might anticipate in each course we proposed to offer and the probable size of classes. We then computed the number of classrooms we would require with an established eighty per cent utilization ratio in a 45-hour week. The size of rooms was determined by taking tablet arm chairs into existing rooms and chalking off on the floor the exact dimensions required to accommodate the varying number of chairs needed for different types of courses.

The use of chemistry laboratories illustrates how space can be wasted. Apparently chemistry instructors believe, at least those at Foothill do, that a three-hour laboratory session will be more effective if it opens with a thirty or forty-minute period of group instruction. Consequently, our chemistry department suggested that space be provided at the end of each chemistry laboratory for as as many arm chairs as there are laboratory stations. This would, of course, result in a waste of space for two hours of each three-hour period. We resolved this by putting the space in the laboratory and then partitioning it off so that it can be used by other classes (such as mathematics) for such hours as it is not used by chemistry laboratory groups.

We experimented with faculty office size. The faculty recommended — and the Board agreed — that there should be individual faculty offices. But there was concern lest some administration might some day crowd two desks into each office, something we saw happening on many campuses. Consequently we asked a faculty committee to use a desk, file cabinet, bookcase, and chairs in order to determine the point at which a second desk might be placed in an office. The conclusion was that an office which has seventy-five square feet or certainly eighty square feet could accommodate a second desk. Accordingly, each of our 175 offices will have a maximum of seventy-one square feet.

Special purpose rooms, we observed, appeared to have the lowest utilization. We found many colleges with a band room as well as a chorus practice room. Yet schedules showed that actual assignment of the band room averaged eighteen hours per week and that of the chorus room only twelve hours per week. We have worked out combinations under which our music rooms will be used about thirty-six hours per week.

I have reported these examples to illustrate the type of analyses we have made to help us plan a campus which we can fully utilize. Some may suggest that this is not institutional research — and they may be correct. We are confident, however, that our studies have contributed to the efficiency of our plant.

I now refer to two features of our facilities on which we propose to make studies, the results of which will, we hope, be of value to other colleges:

1. We have installed an Olympic size pool. Originally we planned three separate pools. A study of construction costs demonstrated, however, that a large pool would cost less than three small pools. It is also possible that a single large pool will be less expensive to maintain and operate. With this possibility in mind, we will keep very careful figures on the operation of our large pool — and compare our costs with those for three smaller pools. Our findings may be of value to colleges contemplating the construction of facilities for swimming.

2. In cooperation with the Educational Facilities Laboratories and with major rug companies, we have carpeted our library and one classroom. We are committed to keeping records on the costs of cleaning the carpets, and the effect of carpeting on heating requirements. We will also study possible sound reduction resulting from the use of carpeting and will attempt to arrive at judgments regarding the effect of floor covering on student conduct.

Up to the present at Foothill College we have placed major emphasis on studies related to planning our plant. As we look to the future, however, we propose to concentrate on instructional improvement. Our projections of studies in this area are not sufficiently advanced to make it possible for me to report our plans to you.

I shall, however, refer to one development on which we have begun to work. I am referring to our use of a video tape recorder — a recent gift to the College. Through the use of this, an instructor can see and hear himself teach, much as can an athlete who studies films of his performance. A video tape recorder with a technician is available to any faculty member who wishes to use it to watch and hear himself in action. Administrators do not see the projections unless invited by the faculty member concerned. The use of this recorder obviously provides opportunities for varied types of studies, the results of which should contribute to improved instruction.

As I indicated earlier, Foothill College is not yet deeply involved in institutional analysis. We are, however, committed to institutional research and are confident that our studies will result in significantly improved education for our students.

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ACCREDITATION

Lewis B. Mayhew, *Director, Evaluation and Research, University of South Florida, and Director of Research, Stephens College*

Samuel Capon once castigated the accrediting agencies as being "seven devils in place of one." Accrediting has been blamed as a bane and a curse and praised as a unique strength of a democratic educational enterprise. Obviously accreditation, as a human institution, is probably both. Accredition is a social institution created to meet definite social needs. It is a means by which minimum standards of performance can be maintained in schools and colleges in the absence of governmental methods for doing so. It is the method by which the institutions of the nation can know their sister institutions which do and do not meet the standards set by the stronger schools and colleges. It is a way by which students and parents and the general public can have some idea of the quality of education being offered. It is a system which can help the professions maintain an effective training program for new members. It is almost a completely voluntary process by which independent schools and colleges subject themselves to the judgment of their peers.

Recently the various regional and professional accrediting agencies have enunciated other significant responsibilities. They wish to help schools improve their programs. They seek to facilitate communication between institutions. They contribute to the training of future leaders in education. They conduct research on vexing problems confronting all education. But their primary task remains that of certifying effective educational establishments. Such a function is now coming to have the greatest significance since the formation of accrediting groups in the nineteenth century. As the nation faces the crisis of doubling a collegiate population within ten years, (from 3,500,000 to 6 or 7,000,000 students) it must utilize even the weakest of existing institutions and create new ones as well. Each must be certified eventually if the nation's educational needs are properly to be met. Given the premise of the significance of accreditation it is possible to examine ways to maximize its effectiveness.

A. THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS.

The accreditation process begins when an institution decides it wishes to be certified by its peers.

Following a decision to seek accreditation the institution conducts a self-study or a self-analysis. This is an elaborate procedure designed to reveal the strengths and weaknesses of the college or university. It is a process by which the institution puts in order the various information it possesses about itself, examines the history of the enterprise and decides what it should be in the future. The self-study should be concerned with the kind of constituency being served and how its needs are being met. It should reveal the ability of the college to meet those needs and to maintain itself over a long period. The analysis allows comparison with institutions already certified and, when discrepancies appear, it suggests means of removing them. The self-study, while it will normally make use of forms and questions developed by the accrediting association, is expected to be unique to the institution conducting it. The accrediting associations have been reluctant to prepare a manual for the actual process of self-study in the belief that to do so would render the process sterile. They have believed that, as an institution decides on the way it will study itself, it will gain knowledge and insight. Thus the first step in the self-study is the decision of questions to be asked so that answers when found will reveal an accurate and helpful picture of the institution.

Once the self-study is completed and the report prepared the accrediting association sends an examining team to visit the applicant. The size of this group will vary depending on the particular association, and the size and complexity of the institution. Its members will be faculty or administrative officers from already accredited institutions within the region. Hopefully they will have had fairly broad experience and an ability to appraise sympathetically but critically the efforts of the applicant. Possibly the success of the visitation is akin to the possibility of successful psycho-therapy. If the right patient finds the right therapist, he will have somewhat better than a fifty-fifty chance to recover. Possibly this is too pessimistic a statement. The fact remains that examiners do vary in their skill in making such a complicated kind of analysis. If, for example, a relatively inadequate examiner from a traditional institution were to visit an extremely experimental program, the results might be disastrous for the hopes of the applicant. The accrediting associations are beginning to be more sensitive to the importance of examiners and are developing training programs for them. The leadership project of the North Central Association is an excellent example.

The review team spends several days on the campus looking at the physical plant, examining records, and talking with students, faculty and administration. Hopefully its members will visit classes, the library, extra-class activities, and if possible faculty or committee meetings. One examiner always requests a faculty tea or social hour to help him form some opinion of the intellectual alertness of the faculty. Another takes all of his meals with student groups and still another checks the library every other hour. Some examiners are preoccupied with budgets and statistics while others try to absorb the feel of the institution by visiting many different activities. Whatever the mode of operation the visit is completed and a report made together with recommendations as to whether accreditation is or is not warranted. The recommendations themselves are sent to the association's board of review which holds a hearing on the report of the visitation team. The president of the institution and the chairman of the examining team are invited to the hearing which will normally last an hour to an hour and a half. The board of review eventually makes its recommendations to the entire association which acts usually at the annual meeting. Once the parent body has acted the results are communicated to the applicant.

B. THE SELF-STUDY.

At each step in this rather involved process the institution's self-study is examined as the crucial document. From it each person involved forms his impressions of the quality of the applicant. Thus the preparation of the self-study is of intense significance for a college. However, it should have an even greater significance. It should be an honest appraisal of the institution at the time it is made. It should reveal candidly the institution's weaknesses since only through clarity of analysis can improvement come. Diagnosis always must precede prognosis and recovery. Obviously it should also indicate strengths as well.

There are several ways to conduct a self-study. If the institution has an office of institutional research, such an agency can be largely responsible for obtaining most of the information needed. It can fill in the necessary forms, and by having recourse to the catalogue, brochures, annual reports and the like, prepare a reasonably accurate, but possibly superficial description of the college. If the personnel of the office are competent, such a procedure is possibly the least expensive and the most efficient method for the preparation of a self-study report. However, that is all it will be. It will be a report which may satisfy the examiners and it may meet requirements for accreditation. It will not, however, alert the faculty to its responsibilities to the institution. It will not result in the growth which comes from searching analysis. It will not make much difference in the life of the college.

Another method is to allow the various groups of the faculty to be responsible for reporting on relevant parts of the institution. This does allow for faculty involvement and very likely will result in growth. It is also likely to result in faculty frustration as it tries to assemble unfamiliar data. The data once accumulated may also be somewhat distorted and unreliable.

Still another alternative which seems to have much in its favor involves the blending of the resources of the office of institutional research with those of the faculty and the rest of the institution. Under this plan a coordinating committee representing faculty and administration is designated. If a college has an office of institutional research its director should be on this, either as chairman, or as a voting, *ex officio* member. This committee is assigned responsibility for the design of the self-study, creation of faculty committees to carry out parts of it, setting of deadlines, communication to all self-study committees regarding their mutual and respective progress, review of committee findings and eventually preparation of the final report. This coordinating committee clearly is the essence of the entire self-study. The director of institutional research should participate actively in all self-study committees. He is, or can be, central in insuring communication between the working groups.

The coordinating committee should create other self-study committees. The responsibilities assigned these will vary from institution to institution but in aggregate should account for all aspects of the life of the college. One self-study used: Purposes and Goals, the Curriculum, Extra-Class Life, Conditions of Faculty Service, Administrative Structure, Financial Bases, Methods of Instruction, Resources for Instruction and Student Life. Each committee should be given its charge and dates at which reports are due. Committees should be urged to report weekly and these reports circulated to the chairmen of all committees. The duplicating machines will be busy but the effort is worth while. The exchange of information contained in these reports is invaluable in keeping the entire institution informed regarding progress of the study.

Before leaving the formal structure of the self-study effort, several small but important aspects should be mentioned. First, there is the matter of length of time. An institution may undertake an exhaustive study which will take years to finish. Possibly the research done will possess great rigor and some of the studies may be publishable in scholarly journals. However, such an effort leaves the faculty fatigued and frequently without the incentives to put into operation the suggestions stemming from the self-study. In a shorter period, possibly from between twelve to eighteen months, many refinements of research design are not possible. Many problems must be touched only superficially. The compensation is that the faculty can always see the end of the study, and when it reaches the end, will still be creative enough to put new ideas into practice.

Allied with the length is the matter of deadlines. Unless definite due dates are listed in advance there is danger that the self-study effort will become diffused. At the time the coordinating committee creates its subordinate agencies it should develop a time table of dates for the completion of reports. As the self-study progresses there will be strong temptation to modify these dates. In general the temptation should be resisted. The few days or weeks gained will not be worth sacrificing the feeling of satisfaction which faculty groups get from meeting their scheduled report dates.

Faculty and administration are not alone in their concerns for the outcomes of a self-study. The coordinating committee should arrange definitely for periodic reports to the Board of Trustees and to the student body. When Stephens College made its latest self-study, it used closed circuit television to report to students and to solicit from them ideas for the future. A total of five different hours were used. In each, the first twenty minutes was devoted to a presentation of some part of the self-study. The last thirty minutes were devoted to student discussion of the topic presented. The written reports from each of the fifty-two groups were later analyzed and reported to the self-study committees.

In the process of the self-study the office of institutional research should be called upon to furnish considerable routine information. If the office has long been in existence, these data should be relatively easy to obtain. If the service is new, the sheer accumulation of data will consume much time and a great deal of effort and ingenuity.

Among information typically required in a self-study are biographical data on faculty put into interpretable form; reports on student characteristics including their academic ability, socio-economic levels, vocational interests, and belief patterns; costs of varied activities, such as instruction, student services, operation of library, research, and administration; analysis of space utilization; and information regarding graduates such as the institutions to which they transfer and their success in their advanced studies, what vocations they enter, where they live, what incomes they earn, and what honors they receive. These are all important kinds of information. If, however, they are all of the data an office of institutional research accumulates or if they represent what the accrediting agency deems important, one can question the worth of either. Accreditation is expensive. So is institutional research. Unless they each concern themselves with fundamental issues, the resources for their support could better be used for other purposes.

C. ROLE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH.

Accreditation agencies are basically interested in strengthening colleges. Institutional research can most notably contribute to the goals and process of accreditation through studies and investigations which provide a basis for institutional improvement. Institutional research can help explore the really critical problems of collegiate education. Perhaps the most central of these are those that relate to purpose and philosophy and the statement of objectives which can condition learning. The whole process of evaluation, which is central in much of institutional research, can be used to help clarify objectives. Educational goals are value statements resting on the bases of the expressed needs of society and the psychological functioning of students. In abstract form they can neither guide an institution nor can they be studied by empirical means. Abstract objectives such as "belief in the worth and dignity of human beings" or "appreciation of the good, the true and the beautiful" or "development of the skills of critical thinking" need to be specified in terms of what people do or say or think when they demonstrate achievement of the broader goals. This is the first step in evaluation. People in institutional research can help faculty members take this step. Frequently the very attempt to specify an objective in terms of behavior reveals that the objective itself is not understood. The next steps in evaluation (finding significant and realistic learning experiences, identifying methods of determining student achievement, and eventually referring the findings back to the value statement itself) are also useful.

People specifically charged with institutional research can, however, make other contributions. By keeping abreast of current research they can enrich faculty discussion. For example, a discussion of what majors an institution should offer will be better focused if relevant national data regarding majors are introduced.

Workers in institutional research can contribute much to faculty deliberations about goals by reading and reporting on the volume of materials available on social criticism and social goals. With an awareness of the cultural conflicts between a Latin and an Anglo-Saxon population, a faculty committee can set more realistic objectives for an institution whose constituency comes from both groups. Institutional research should provide information on the basis of which a faculty can develop an understanding of the cultural background of its students. Most faculty members, trying to keep up with the literature in their own fields, do not have the time to probe into the vast amounts of materials currently available as a background for establishing college objectives. If a committee is to chart the course of an institution for the decade of the sixties, it should be aware of such things as the statement of national goals, the Rockerfeller reports on national purpose, the critical commentary of a Mills or a Reisman, the analyses of the growing leisure in America. Workers in institutional research should routinely absorb the meanings of such statements.

Faculty discussions of objectives are highly theoretical. This can be good. Assumptions and postulates should, however, be tested against fact. An excellent logical case can be made for requiring two years of a foreign language. But when a staff examines the evidence of actually what long term values accrue from only two years of language, the logic begins to falter.

Institutional research personnel can also be of use in studying the dynamics of instruction. If a research service is properly lodged administratively, its director will not have administrative control over faculty. Thus this officer can probe into teaching without generating feelings of anxiety in faculty members. During a self-study, for example, the director might visit a member of classes, record his impressions and then report to the committee on instruction. Or from his analysis of teaching rating scales he can suggest what appear to be the weaknesses of the instructional program. He can also report on research of other colleges on teaching procedures and can suggest objective ways of observing classes. If the Office of Institutional Research has responsibility for the testing program, the director can report the insights about teaching he has gained from studying course examinations. A committee discussion of teaching, with a background of factual kind of information, will be more rewarding than will the usual sharing of prejudices.

The director of research can also be helpful to a committee which is studying the college advising program. He can interview students, watch advising conferences, study advising done elsewhere and report his findings and observations to the self-study committee. Similarly, he can sit *ex officio* as a member of faculty committees to determine such things as faculty morale, how committees are doing their business. By means of questionnaires he can search for differences in perception of the institution by different faculty members. In a word, the director of institutional research can become the fact gathering agency for self-study committees. He presumably has the time for this and, since he is out of the line organization of the institution, can accumulate information and impressions with the least disturbance to the faculty.

Another important function which the director of institutional research can serve for the self-study committees is to be a gadfly. If a competent individual of appropriate temperament is appointed to the position of director and if he can command the respect of the faculty, he can be invaluable by asking penetrating questions and by stretching the logic of committee members. He can ask whether opposition to a particular proposal is due to vested interest or to educational theory. Successfully to fulfill the role of gadfly the director needs to be personally secure so that his critical queries do not represent a vindictive defense but are really in the best interests in the program. He should be enough satisfied with the status of his position so that he is not inhibited through a desire to move into higher posts. He above all needs to refrain from developing a closed philosophy himself. Successfully to be a gadfly the representative of institutional research should travel some so that he knows at first hand what problems in education are and how they are being solved in different parts of the country or region.

Certainly related to the previously mentioned function is another service which the office of institutional research can render. If the director fulfills his responsibilities well he should be in almost constant contact with every faculty and administrative group on the campus. While he ostensibly visits them for other substantive reasons he should be sensitive to inter-personal and inter-group relations. He should know when fatigue is beginning to hit the faculty. He should sense when the new president's honeymoon is over. He should be able to document college trouble spots.

D. CONCLUSION.

Our discussion has assumed a rather comprehensive program of institutional research. The question naturally arises whether an institution, particularly a small one, can afford such a service. An equally cogent question is, can the college afford not to have such service? The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey will invest two or three million dollars in a study of the feasibility of building a fifty million dollar refinery. One wonders how many major educational decisions are based on as thorough research. An institution putting in a new department of music may be planning a ten to fifteen million dollar effort when one includes cost of buildings, facilities, instruction, and operation. How many colleges would use $200,000 or even $20,000 of planning money to work out the details of projecting a new department? Colleges and universities have simply not as yet invested the necessary resources to study the problems about which decisions must be made.

A related question is whether accrediting agencies are or will become mature enough to encourage candid self-study and frank reporting of results. Often, self-studies, made with a view to convincing an accrediting association, describe an institution's best features and rationalize weaknesses. Several colleges which have been candid, have been misunderstood by examiners accustomed to seeing only rose tinted reports. Unless the self-study can be honest in its appraisal of strengths and weaknesses the process of accreditation will lose its educative value and be simply a certifying method and possibly a dishonest one.

If institutions can see the wisdom of spending resources for effective institutional research and if accrediting associations can encourage honest appraisal, much will have been accomplished. Further cautions, however, are in order.

If such a study is to be effective, the faculty and administration must be willing to have repeated committee meetings, develop and respond to questionnaires, and collect widely varied appropriate data. An office of institutional research can exercise leadership in such an undertaking and can help solve technical problems. It must not, however, do the major work of the study. Self-studies are processes in which the faculty gains as much from participation as from the conclusions reached. Wide staff involvement is essential.

Both institutional research and self-study imply change. This does not mean change for its own sake. Rather the implication is that change is inevitable and that increasingly desirable changes can be made on the basis of effective institutional research, including self-studies. A college which is confident that it has solved all of its problems will not accept institutional research and should not even attempt a self-study. An administration and faculty ought not undertake such a study unless they are willing to see even time-honored practices discarded.

Given a staff willingness to accept change, a self-study, aided by institutional research, can cultivate conditions in which desirable changes can take place. In a real sense this is education — an achievement of the purposes of accreditation, of self-study, of institutional research.

PANEL: INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND THE ACCREDITATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

HENRY T. TYLER, *Executive Secretary,*
California Junior College Association, Chairman

After Lewis B. Mayhew's address on "Institutional Research and Accreditation," Dr. Thomas presented Dr. Henry T. Tyler, Executive Secretary, California Junior College Association, to serve as chairman of a panel discussion on "Institutional Research and the Accreditation of Junior Colleges."

Dr. Tyler introduced the following panel members:

P. M. Bliss, Dean of Instruction, San Jose City College
Gilbert A. Collyer, President, Shasta College
Albert D. Graves, Vice President, Los Angeles State College
John Lombardi, President, Los Angeles City College
J. W. McDaniel, Vice President, San Bernardino Valley College
Guy M. Rose, Instructor of Mathematics, Santa Monica City College
Herbert L. Swanson, Fellow in Junior College Administration, UCLA, and Intern in Junior College Administration, El Camino College

Dr. Tyler urged members of the audience to participate freely in the panel discussion.

Dr. Lombardi, referring to the sociologists' dictum that no institution ever reforms itself, inquired whether it would be reasonable to expect the accreditation process to accomplish reforms in educational institutions. Dr. Mayhew challenged the sociologists' generalization, remarking that history offers many examples of major institutions which have reformed themselves in response to external threats. He cited the position of the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Counter-Reformation as analogous to that of educational institutions today and voiced his confidence that the educational system, faced with the stimulus of outside pressures, can itself effect the necessary reforms.

Mr. McDaniel, explaining that he had served on six accreditation teams and had twice been through the accreditation process at his own institution, expressed doubt that junior colleges have reached a sufficient degree of maturity to present a completely honest assessment of strengths and weaknesses in their applications for accreditation. He felt that each institution strove to project the most flattering, rather than the most accurate, image possible.

Dr. Collyer stated that his own considerable experience in the accreditation program led him to conclude that a great deal of growth has taken place during this period. He said that he had found an increasing frankness on the part of junior colleges, applying for accreditation, in reporting aspects of their institutions which they believe require modification or change. He, therefore, felt that the junior colleges had already taken great strides toward maturity and that the accreditation process itself offers this opportunity.

Dr. Graves said that he considered it important to learn from history when embarking on a program of institutional research and to avoid making some of the mistakes which had discredited such programs in the past. He recalled that the 1920's saw a great upsurge of interest in research in the social sciences, but said that the schools had, at that time, carried their preoccupation with quantifying everything to such ridiculous extremes that a reaction against "research" set in during the 1930's and early 1940's. He welcomed the recurrence of interest in research as an aid to finding sound solutions to vexing problems, but warned that the old mistakes must not be repeated. He said that he, like Mr. McDaniel, wondered whether the motivation for research should be to secure accreditation, since the importance of accreditation to the very life of an institution may prevent the objectivity required in meaningful research. He also cautioned that present research design is quite unsophisticated and that there may not be a bountiful supply of persons with all of Dr. Mayhew's desirable qualities for positions as directors of research. While agreeing that institutional research must be undertaken if colleges are to respond adequately to new challenges, he urged that careful thought be given both to the purposes of research programs and to the means employed to attain these purposes.

Dr. Bliss said that he had been impressed by Dr. Mayhew's article on Accreditation and Instruction in the Junior College Journal.[21] When San Jose City College was applying for accreditation, the faculty committee preparing the report had wished to base their self-study on a question suggested by this article: "What change and what growth do we find occurring in our students?" The committee felt that a study geared to a consideration of this question in terms of courses and curricula, kinds of instructors and instruction, student personnel relationships, admission policies, etc. would have genuine value to the institution; realizing, however, that they would first have to clear the proposed study with the accrediting agency and then do such a good job that no question of their unorthodox approach would arise, the committee backed off and submitted its report in the usual form. Dr. Bliss suggested that, since the junior colleges are vitally concerned with the excellence of their instruction, the accreditation process might well be related to a study of instructional quality.

Dr. Lowell Barker, President of Antelope Valley College, questioned the use of the word "research" to describe the information which California junior colleges collect as an aid to making decisions. He remarked that most California colleges are developing so rapidly, and are forced to make so many decisions so frequently, that they have neither the time nor the energy to do "research" in the usual sense of the term. He conceded that a mature institution, like Stephens College, could do research before making decisions, but considered it neither possible nor desirable for young institutions in emerging situations to do so.

Dr. Mayhew reminded the group that his remarks were based on his experience not only at Stephens College but also at the very new University of South Florida, which opened in September 1960 with 1997 students and expects an enrollment of 3900 students in September of 1961.

---

[21] Lewis B. Mayhew. "The Relationship of Instruction to Accreditation." *Junior College Journal,* 30: 187-195. December, 1959.

He said that, even with the urgent pressures imposed by burgeoning enrollments, he would still argue that institutions should make the sort of studies he had been advocating. He felt that such studies could properly be called "research"; that institutional research can be initiated during the first year of a college's existence, and that the only thing necessary is the institution's commitment to the value of research.

Mr. Swanson commented that, since most junior colleges seemed to be conducting studies of some kind and finding them useful, it did not seem particularly important whether the studies were considered "pure research" or not. He suggested that a new term, "institutional research," be used to designate studies undertaken to improve the institution.

Dr. James Nelson, Administrative Dean - Research, Orange Coast College, referred to a study conducted at that institution of a large-class vs. small-class instructional program. He pointed out that the study had utilized the careful controls and recognized techniques of responsible research, that it had been conducted not for the purpose of accreditation but to determine how best to serve the educational needs of the vastly expanded student body which is anticipated, and that it had provided the factual data on which a sound instructional program can be based.

Mr. McDaniel said that he was strongly in favor of this kind of research and thought that it could be used more extensively and effectively if it were not related to accreditation.

Dr. Tyler remarked that some of the discussion seemed to suggest that the only motivation for institutional research is to "get by" an accreditation visit and that, if it were not for accreditation, there would be little or no institutional research. He said that he suspected, and that Mr. Swanson's studies reinforced his judgment, that California junior colleges had in fact conducted a great number of studies and were continuing to do so.

Dr. Lombardi pointed out that most junior colleges must regularly compile data as an essential part of their operations for annual reports to their governing boards, etc. He said that Los Angeles City College, for example, has, over the years, accumulated a large body of information on such matters as faculty salaries, faculty load, and instructional practices, which is preserved in readily accessible form. However, he explained that in many junior colleges there lurks a fear that institutional research, or perhaps a particular form of institutional research, may become a requirement for accreditation once the visiting teams are directed to inquire into a college's research program, or even that all colleges may be expected to employ a Director of Research.

Dr. Mayhew said that he wished to make his position clear. He stated that any self-respecting institution is constantly doing research intended to improve instruction whether or not this research function has been assigned to a specific officer, and that he had simply been addressing himself to the unique ways in which this whole body of activity is used or misused in the accreditation process. He hoped that no one thought he had been saying that institutional research was for the sole purpose of accreditation, since all institutions have a basic need to get the best kinds of information possible in order to make valid decisions.

Mr. Frank Cox, Counselor and Instructor of Psychology and Political Science, Glendale College, asked Dr. Mayhew where colleges might find the "gadfly" Director of Research he advocated, someone who could stand between the administation and the faculty, needle both and receive no criticism or resentment from either. Dr. Mayhew replied that successful "gadfly" qualities are in large measure a product of institutional organization and are made by setting up the position outside the line organization. This makes him feel himself a part of the administration and a part of the faculty but with no administrative control over anyone. By creating a climate in which he would be related to all parts of the institution but not too tightly bound to any one part, he can achieve a "gadfly" status and perform the desired function of the "sociological stranger" or the "participating observer."

Dr. Graves remarked that all educational institutions will have to do more research because there are more problems demanding solution. He pointed out that there are many competencies on existing college faculties —more than can be found in any one individual—to carry on various kinds of research, and wondered whether particular programs of institutional research might not be assigned to appropriate faculty members. Dr. Mayhew agreed that colleges should start using the talents which are already available on their faculties.

Dr. Thomas observed that some colleges hesitate to use faculty members for institutional studies because they do not wish to release them from their primary assignments in the classroom. He said that Santa Monica City College had assigned faculty members, without releasing them from regular teaching loads, to conduct a thorough study of the grades earned in other collegiate institutions by transfers from SMCC. He asked Mr. Guy Rose, chairman of the faculty committee involved, whether he felt that this assignment had interfered significantly with his teaching responsibilities. Mr. Rose replied that it had not, that a twelve-man committee had worked for a year on the study, and that the faculty members concerned felt that they had profited from the enhanced insights into the instructional program which they had gained from their study.

Dr. Mayhew said that classroom teachers present should know that, while progress is being made in accumulating the kinds of information they would like to have, institutional research is still a relatively primitive art and that there are many things the researchers do not yet know how to do. As an example he cited the urgent need for valid instruments to measure personal characteristics, so that reliable information may be gathered on students' biographical backgrounds. Mr. McDaniel, while agreeing that much remains to be done, pointed out that educators are not a group of "know-nothings" but that they have, over the years, built up a considerable body of knowledge on which to draw in making decisions.

Mr. Charles Locks, Instructor in Psychology, Los Angeles Valley College, suggested that it would be desirable to make and keep continuing records on a group of studies on curricula, faculty, drop-outs, testing, etc. and to exchange the data on matters which are significant for all junior colleges. Dr. Tyler agreed that there is a real need for a greater compilation of the results of studies made independently by different institutions. He thought that such compilations would be valuable for all institutions entirely apart from any accrediting process, although he suggested that the compilation process might be worked out through accreditation channels. He said that the problem of better dissemination of reports on studies already conducted should be regarded as important "unfinished business" of this conference.

Dr. Johnson stated that there was no one answer to the problem of exchanging information and reports of studies, but that a number of different approaches would have to be worked out. He reminded the group that an invitation had been extended by Dr. Grant Morrison, of the United States Office of Education, to report to him institutional studies which he might include in the bibliography of research studies, particularly unpublished studies, which he is preparing. Dr. Johnson urged that as many California junior colleges as possible send reports of representative research studies they have made to:

Dr. Grant Morrison
U.S. Office of Education
Division of Higher Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Tyler said that, while it is extremely important to work out more adequate dissemination of the results of institutional studies, attention should be called to the potential danger which lies in any compulsion an institution feels to attempt everything it learns that other colleges are doing. He stated that in reading the reports of the 126 accreditation visits conducted in California to date, he was disturbed by the increasing degree of sameness creeping into these reports, and he emphasized the importance of retaining the diversity which has been one of the California junior colleges' proudest boasts.

Dr. Julio Bortolazzo, President, College of San Mateo, expressed hope that the accreditation process might be entering upon a new phase. He felt that the original "counting" (of financial resources, teachers, equipment, etc.) might be over and that the Commission could henceforth attempt a qualitative assessment of an institution's program, making much wider use of faculty members on the visiting teams than in the past. He said that, in his judgment, the move toward quality was the most imperative necessity facing the colleges, and toward this end he stressed the following points: 1) Institutional research should so far as possible be sustained; it should be carried on by permanent committees rather than organized on a "one-shot" basis in preparation for accreditation. 2) Teachers must take the lead in institutional research, even if they must be relieved of a portion of their teaching load to do so.

Mr. Walter Coultas, Assistant Superintendent, Los Angeles City Schools, reported that faculty members have been deliberately included in planning the large new building program in Los Angeles. He also suggested that the reason for the similarity in accreditation reports noted by Dr. Tyler might be the kits which are sent out by the Commission. He said that, when all institutions follow the common format of the kits, there is no way to avoid this sameness. He suggested that the kits be "left at home" and that each institution be free to conduct its self-study in the manner of its choice.

Dr. Collyer commented that, despite the tendency of the accreditation reports to follow a common format, the differences among California institutions are amazing. He defended the kits as a means of setting standards for the use of the colleges in developing their reports and, while agreeing with Dr. Bortolazzo that the base of the accreditation teams should be broadened by the inclusion of faculty members, felt that the accreditation process, as it has functioned to date, has not tended to blur the distinctions between different institutions or to repress the unique qualities of any. He stressed the extreme importance of long-term institutional research and suggested that it might take accreditation to promote such sustained research in the smaller institutions.

Dr. Walter Garcia, President, Modesto College, confessed that the relationship between institutional research and accreditation was still not clear to him. He said that if, as he suspected, the Accreditation Commission was, in effect, saying that it would be helpful if some data were available in the colleges for the visiting teams, then this point should be made clear to the colleges and the kit should indicate the specific kinds of data which the teams would find useful. He also mentioned that there should be some standardization of the kinds of data, so that comparable data may be assembled for different institutions.

Dr. Nelson wondered why there seemed to be objections to requiring accreditation teams to look for evidence of research, when the conference discussions indicated a general recognition of the importance of faculty involvement in institutional research. He said that since the group consensus was clearly in favor of encouraging more research involving more academic personnel, it would seem to him all to the good if visiting teams looked to see if such research were being conducted.

Dr. Lombardi replied that all institutions were in favor of research and were continuously engaged in those studies they thought necessary for their own purposes. However, he saw no point in duplicating conclusive studies which had already been completed by other institutions or agencies. He mentioned that the United States Office of Education, for example, conducts rather thorough surveys of particular problems and publishes its findings; it may be more profitable for an individual college to utilize these data than to embark on its own studies of the same problems. He emphasized that he was not against research, but that he would continue to oppose any attempt to force a pattern on all institutions to fit a prearranged formula. Stating that the heart of an institution is its educational program, he urged that accreditation be based primarily upon the quality of instruction, that earnest efforts be made to devise the best possible methods of measuring excellence of the educational program, and that other aspects of the institution be considered secondary to this prime function.

Dr. Tyler stated that the Accrediting Commission has been seeking for some months to find ways of putting greater emphasis on assessing the quality of an institution's instruction; some aids for this difficult appraisal have been devised, but it is impossible at this time to predict how successful they will prove in practice. He said that the Commission is also considering a possible drastic simplification of procedure as the third accrediting cycle is entered into. He cautioned, however, that all such innovations can be viewed only in the most tentative way at present, since it appears probable that accreditation will take a new direction in California within the near future, with the Western College Association probably being replaced as the accrediting agency by a new Association which includes four-year colleges, junior colleges and high schools.

Dr. Tyler also announced that Dr. Lowell Barker had recently brought to the attention of the Accrediting Commission a promising method of increasing participation in visiting teams. Reminding the group that the Commission had tried to include as many persons as possible on the teams, rather than to train a small corps of expert visitors, he said that the Commission had welcomed Dr. Barker's suggestion that there might be districts which would be willing to pay the expenses of an additional person on an accrediting team to serve as an assistant to the chairman and thereby get experience in the accrediting process. Dr. Barker had already offered to defray expenses for a representative of his district, and Dr. Lamar Johnson had expressed hope that some Kellogg Fellows could be included in the program. Dr. Tyler reported that each college would be getting a letter from the Commission outlining the proposal and asking for nominations of personnel from the institution's faculty or administrative staff.

Dr. Thomas concluded the discussion by assuring the group on behalf of the Accrediting Commission that the last thing any Commission member had in mind was to force structured proposals for the organization of institutional research on anyone. He urged any institution which felt itself being "pressured" on this matter to speak up promptly and forcefully.

Dr. Thomas expressed thanks to the program panelists and participants, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Occasional Reports from UCLA Junior College Leadership Program:

1. Frederick C. Kintzer. *Faculty Handbooks In California Public Junior Colleges,* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 1) Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1961. Price one dollar.
2. Frederick C. Kintzer. *Board Policy Manuals In California Public Junior Colleges* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 2) Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1962. Price one dollar.
3. *Institutional Research In The Junior College — A Report of a Conference* (Junior College Leadership Program, Occasional Report No. 3) Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, 1962.